

The Classical Review

JUNE 1887.

JOHAN NICOLAI MADVIG.

(7 Aug. 1804—12 Dec. 1886.)

IN the Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift for 1887, nos. 6 and 7 (5 and 12 Febr.), M. Cl. Gertz gives an account of his sometime teacher and late colleague, from which I take what follows:

Madvig was born in the town Svaneke in the island Bornholm. His father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, filled the office of 'Gerichtsschreiber' (magistrates' clerk). As early as his tenth year Johan N. helped his father to keep the books of the court. The familiarity with law thus early gained was turned to account both in his writings and in practical life.

In 1816 his father died, and in the next year by the help of friends he was sent to the grammar-school of Frederiksborg in Seeland. In 1820 he entered the University of Copenhagen, and in Jan. 1825 passed his philological examination with the testimony: *laudabilis unanimi consensu*. A month later appeared 'Gasparis Garatonii notae in Ciceronis orationes, ex edit. Neap. seorsum editae per quinque iuvenes Haunienses'; among the five were Madvig and his friends Elberling and R. Henrichsen. On the 15 July 1826 he defended for his master's degree his 'emendationes in Cic. libr. de legg. et acad.' Shortly after, when Prof. Thorlacius left Denmark for two years, Madvig was appointed his deputy. In 1828 he wrote 'epistola crit. ad Orellium de orat. Verinarum libris II extremis emendandis' and his doctor's dissertation 'de Q. Asconii . . . et aliorum veterum interpretum in Ciceronis orationes commentariis.' Though Thorlacius had returned, Madvig remained as Lector at the University, and on T's death was appointed Professor Eloquentiae (in the Latin language and literature) on 17 Nov. 1829. From 1826 to the end of 1879 he continued to teach in the University with an interval of three years (16 Nov. 1848—4 Dec. 1851),

NOS. V. & VI. VOL. I.

during which he was Minister of Worship. From 1832-48 he was also University Librarian, and from 1848-74 (with the same interval) Inspector of Education. In the Danish Academy of Science he was President from 1867 to his death. He was also an active politician, member of the Danish Parliament from 1848-74, and President of the Council (Reichsrat) from 1856-63. As Professor Eloquentiae he was required to write the University programmes, collected in his *Opuscula Academica* (1834, 1842). He was engaged on a second enlarged edition of these volumes at his death. In 1830 he published for the first time 'Ciceronis orationes sel. xii,' seven times reprinted with continual improvements (since 1876 containing only ten speeches). In the same year appeared Henrichsen's Cic. de or., in which his friend had a large share. In 1835 followed the Cato and Laelius of Cicero; in 1839 Madvig's *opus magnum* Cic. de fin. (again 1869 and 1876). In 1840 appeared the first Danish, in 1843 the first German, edition of his Latin Grammar; in 1846 the first Danish, 1847 the first German, edition of his Greek Syntax (supplemental pamphlets 'Bemerkungen' u. s. w. accompanied each of the German grammars). The *Emendationes Livianae* appeared 1860 (sec. enlarged ed. 1877); the edition of Livy, in which Ussing had a hand, 1861-6 (bks. i-v now in the 3rd, xxi-xxv in the 4th ed.). The third great critical work 'Adversaria critica' appeared in 1871-73, and 1884. Contributions to reviews, chiefly Danish, were collected in 'Kleine philologische Schriften 1875' in a German version. In preparing this work Madvig so strained his already weak sight, that thenceforward he could scarcely read or write. He still continued to lecture, employing his two daughters and various young friends and students as

K

readers and secretaries. No important work,—and that not only in classical philology,—escaped his attention; he read again many classical authors, and made acquaintance with others for the first time. For his last great work 'The Constitution and Administration of the Roman State' (1881–2, 2 vols) he had already laid the foundation in his lectures; but he went over the whole ground, including the *corpus inscriptionum*, anew.

He was indisputably the greatest classical scholar, that we have had in the Scandinavian north, and a place will be made for him among the greatest, who have won distinction in this science in any land, at any time.

Gertz pays a warm tribute to Madvig's geniality, high sense of honour, and love of truth; to his tact in estimating and classifying manuscript tradition; to the thoroughness and simplicity of his exegesis; to his clear insight into the life of ancient Greece and Rome; to his services as minister of state and inspector of schools. 'He was the hero of the whole Danish student-world, and to the last delighted to associate with them.'

In 1875 I had the great happiness of sitting next to Madvig at a dinner given by the University of Leyden to the guests at its tercentenary. I saw the first meeting between him and Cobet, and remembered the description given by the aged Gersdorf some ten years before, of the meeting between Friedrich Jacobs and his old correspondent Gottfried Hermann. Madvig had a singular grace and ease of manner. He seemed to feel that 'humane letters' had been freed from a stain, when I assured him that we in England were indignant with Ritschl for admitting into the *Rheinisches Museum* (1875, 91–117) a flippant¹ article by Lehrs, 'Adversarien über Madvig's Ad-

versarien und ihren Verfasser. Zur Abwehr geistloser Kritik in der klassischen Philologie.'

Cobet, in proposing Madvig's health as the acknowledged master of the critical art, added: 'but we will not make a pope of you; *pugnabimus tecum, contendemus tecum, eoque vehementius pugnabimus, quo te vehementius admiramur*.' Madvig began his reply thus. *Post Cobetum latine loqui vereor*; but soon passed from compliments to give some admirable advice to the students. I asked about his teachers; he said he was *autodidakt*.

It is melancholy to think that the article in which Ritschl charges Madvig with Philautia, Authadeia, Hybris, has been embalmed for all time in his *Opuscula* iii. 172. It would be well however if some young scholar would act upon his suggestion that a *critica vannus* might do good service in winnowing the chaff from the grain in Madvig's *Adversaria*. It is plain at first sight that Madvig's knowledge of metre was imperfect; many of his guesses on minor authors are hasty, and would have been abandoned by him on second thoughts; in some cases the common lexicons prove the correctness of readings which he condemns. His familiarity with ante- and post-classical Latin was by no means on a par with his mastery of Ciceronian and Livian style. Nor does he display that nice sense of usage which makes the study of J. F. Gronovius, Ruhnken, Heindorf, Cobet, so instructive. Robust common sense, revolting against impossibilities in thought or expression, a clear perception of what the context required, a close adherence to the *ductus litterarum*, seem to me his great merits as a critic.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

¹ See p. 117. 'Wie man die Begabung eines Kopfes wie Madvig auch bezeichnen möge, ein Geist ist er gar nicht.' How different the tone of Bücheler, the

present editor of the *Rh. Mus.*, who wrote in a presentation copy of a tract *MADVIGIO PHILOGORVM PRINCIPI S. FL. D. FRANC. BYEHELER GREGARIUS*.

NOTES ON CONDITIONAL SENTENCES.

GREATLY as the treatment of this subject has been improved by the labours of Goodwin, there seems to be still plenty of work for the reformer to do: and I gladly make use of the *Classical Review* in order to submit some views of my own to the notice of classical scholars. Considerations of space impose upon me brevity of statement and

general disregard of exceptional phenomena: in the following remarks therefore I shall (1) address myself mainly to Latin: (2) consider primarily sentences which I call 'normal,' i.e. which have the same mood and tense in both Protasis and Apodosis, and are not affected by external influences of mood or tense: (3) consider only the verb of the

Protasis. I shall be greatly obliged to any of my readers who will aid me by criticism.

I desire to direct my attack upon the following propositions which I have come to regard as *idola tribus grammaticae*.

I. That the Indicative in the Protasis implies 'reality.' This doctrine has indeed been given up by most authorities, but still lingers in some books, both German (*Realer Fall*), French and English. It is surely enough though to quote such instances as *Pro Milone* 91, 'excitate eum, si potestis, ab inferis,' *Pro Clu.* 62, 'redargue me si mentior,' *Pro Mur.* 80, 'cives, inquam, si eos hoc nomine appellari fas est.' No doubt the context often admits of the possibility that the speaker regards his condition as actually existing, but this is not expressed by the mood which he uses. To deny this is to fail to recognise that the Indicative after 'if' has not the same import as the Indicative in a simple sentence. In a condition the Indicative is colourless—the expression of a purely objective attitude.¹

II. That the Present Subjunctive in the Protasis implies 'possibility' (*Möglicher Fall*). This is the general view of English, French, and German grammars:² but can it be applied without violence? Take such perfectly normal instances as 'si existat hodie ab inferis Lycurgus, gaudeat murorum Spartaë ruinis' (*Livy* xxxix. 37). It is easy to talk about 'subjective Möglichkeit' and 'fabulist's license,' but these are characteristic examples of the usage. How forced is the implication of 'possibility' in *Hor. Epist.* ii. 1. 3, 4, and countless instances. In this point I consider that the new world has outstripped the old: it was a great merit of Goodwin to base the whole treatment of conditional sentences including the

optative (with opt. and *äv* in Apodosis) upon distinctions of *time* instead of upon the categories of 'possibility, slight probability, complete uncertainty, impossibility,' (Farar): and his fellow-countrymen Allen and Greenough in their valuable Latin grammar have followed his lead in treating the Latin Present Subjunctive. Agreeing with them that this tense refers primarily to the Future, I would submit that the true implication of the mood has not yet been assigned. How does Goodwin distinguish *ei prässoi* from *äv prässoi*? The former, he says, is 'less vivid and distinct' than the latter. But how does he distinguish *äv prässoi* from *ei prässei*? Again the former is less 'vivid' than the latter (*M. and T.* § 48, B. i, sixth edition). These three degrees of 'vividness' strike me as eminently unsatisfactory.—Allen and Greenough say that the Present Subjunctive implies 'improbability': this is going too far in the opposite direction: but at any rate it shows a grasp of a feature which runs through the whole class of sentences which have the Subjunctive in Latin (and *äv* in the Apodosis in Greek). That such sentences contain an implication—a sort of *arrière pensée*—is generally admitted in the cases referring to the past and present. Why has not this method been generally applied to future conditions also? Simply, I infer, because grammarians did not see what form of implication to suggest. We cannot speak of an implication of unreality throughout: but may we not say that *ei prässoi touto, kalōs äv êxoi* 'if he were to do this, it would be well,'³ implies, *I do not say that he will (do it)*? I do not quote instances here, because any ordinary instances will do. Is not this the natural sense of 'si neget, mentiatur'? I should describe this as a future condition with reserve. Just as the Pluperfect and Imperfect Subjunctive warn the reader not to suppose that the writer means that his condition was or is realized, so the Present Subjunctive warns the reader not to suppose that the condition will be realized. Owing to the nature of the case we have in the first two cases practically an implication of unreality, in the latter case merely an expression of *reserve*, a sort of sign-post to caution the reader and protect the writer against a possible misconstruction. Using

¹ That the past tenses of the Indicative may be used to express *unreality* is maintained by Professor Priem of Posen in his learned paper in the *Philologus* (*Supplem.* V. 2, 1885): he quotes *De Div.* II. 127, 'Deus si quidem nobis consulebat, "hoc facito, hoc ne feceris" diceret,' *ibid.* II. 20, etc. But he rightly regards such sentences as quite exceptional; in some of his passages (e.g. *Pro Mil.* § 28, *Nat. Deor.* III. 79, 80) I doubt whether we have genuine instances of the 'Irrealer Fall.' In the genuine instances we should have an exact analogy to the French 's'il était' (= if he were), 's'il avait été' (= wenn er gewesen wäre).

² Mr. Roby, however, must be excepted. In his larger grammar (§ 1497) he says '(In hypothetical sentences) the Subjunctive implies that the action spoken of is not a fact. Nothing is implied as to probability or improbability, possibility or impossibility, so far as the mood is concerned; but a non-real past action is of course impossible, a non-real future action is (apart from intrinsic impossibilities) possible.'

³ *En passant* I protest against the translation so commonly given 'if he should do it, it would be well.' I doubt if this combination of *should* and *would* is normal modern English, though it may be easily paralleled from Shakspeare and is constant in certain subbolic constructions.

the Present Subjunctive, the writer seems to me to say, 'In supposing this about a future case, do not imagine that I mean to prophecy that such and such a thing will ever happen.' If this is not the sense of the Greek and Latin, and of the English, 'if he were to deny it,' then we must admit that these languages have no means of expressing so natural an idea as a supposition referring to the future and accompanied by reserve. The future need not be a remote future: it may be but the future of the next moment. But even so, the reference is to an 'hereafter.'¹

But I am far from wishing to limit the Present Subjunctive in Protasis to this sense: some instances, I admit, may be more simply explained as expressing a present supposition with reserve, and are more closely related to the *original jussive sense of the tense* (si sit = supposing it to be [I do not say that it is]): e.g. *Verr.* II. Lib. II. § 52, 'me dies, vox, latera deficiant, si hoc nunc vociferari velim'; *Cat.* I. 18, 'patria tecum sic loquitur' . . . and then, § 19, 'Haec si tecum patria loquatur, nonne impetrare debeat' (this may refer to the future); *De Off.* I. 5, 'hic si sibi ipsi consentiat, neque amicitiam colere possit nec iustitiam, III. 12, 'si sciat . . . dicturus sit.' Sometimes too, but very rarely in prose, the Present Subjunctive expresses a *rejected* supposition of the present: Ovid, *Met.* I. 400, 'quis hoc credat, nisi sit pro teste vetustas' ('were not,' i.e. implying 'it is'), *Pro Mur.* § 21, 'quam ego, si mihi per Servium liceat, pari atque in eadem laude ponam: sed non licet' ('ponam' may however be Future Indicative, cf. Reid on *Pro Arch.* § 4). In five books chosen at random (*Catilinarian Orations, Pro Sestio, Pro Mur., Pro Arch., Hor. Epist., Bk. I.*), this is a solitary instance of this sense. Virg. *Georg.* IV. 117, 'ni vela traham' is a non-normal instance (canerem).

III. That the Imperfect Subjunctive in Protasis refers primarily to the past. This

¹ This method of treatment brings out the analogy between all tenses of the Subjunctive in conditional sentences. Strictly speaking all that is implied by the Imperfect and Pluperfect is mental reserve on the part of the speaker, reflecting upon the relation of his supposition to reality, but in past and present suppositions this reserve is tantamount to an implication of unreality: the future condition is necessarily undecided in regard to fulfilment. If any one is sceptical as to the possibility of the Present Subjunctive referring to the future, I would remind him of final and suboblique clauses and of the close similarity of form between the Future (Future Perfect) Indicative and Present (Perfect) Subjunctive in more than one conjugation.

appears to be the view of Dr. Kennedy, who says (*P. S. Lat. Gr.* § 213) 'si dares, negaret (lit.) if you had been offering, he would have been refusing (*often* = if you offered he would refuse).' It was also the view of Mr. Roby (*Elementary Latin Grammar*, 1862, § 240) 'si periret, dolerem, if he had been perishing, I should have been grieving.' In his later books he says the tense is used in both clauses 'of an action supposed contrary to fact to be already occurring in the present time, or of a continuous state supposed, contrary to the fact, to have existed in past time,' (*Latin Grammar*, § 1530). That is, he now puts the reference to the present and the past on the same footing. In his examples he quotes *Pro Clu.* § 80, 'at tum si dicerem, non audirer,' as if it were quite an ordinary case. Even this modified position seems to me misleading. In Germany the view that the Imperfect Subjunctive in the large majority of cases expresses the rejected supposition of the *present* [e.g. 'nisi Alexander essem, Diogenes esse vellem,' if I were² not Alexander (as I am)] is universally held (*Irrealis der gegenwart*).

Dr. Priem, who is a staunch defender of the accepted German view, quotes from the whole of Cicero only fifty-one instances of sentences with Imperfect Subjunctive in both clauses with clear reference to the past. Caesar has not a single one. Of these fifty-one (add *De Fin.* I. 7), ten are 'verba des können's und müssen's,' which are of course exceptional. I do not pretend to have a definite view about all of the remaining forty-one: but it is clear to me that at least twelve of them have not the simple conditional sense: five contain deliberative Subjunctives in Apodosis (e.g. *Phil.* II. 26), two contain 'ut' for 'si' (*Verr.* IV. 16, 58); *Pro Cael.* 62, contains two very peculiar cases; in *Pro Clu.* 16, the Apodosis, depends on *ne* (acc. to MSS.), in *Verr.* III. 31, 'si' is omitted; in *De Off.* III. 75, 'dares' is jussive. In such cases I do not at all deny that the Imperfect Apodosis refers to the past: but I do deny that its use is to be regarded as parallel to *Pro Clu.* 80, 'at tum si dicerem, non audirer.' Dr. Priem gives no statistics of what he regards as the ordinary sense of the Imperfect (referring to present time). In order therefore to get an

² That this *may* be translated in English 'if I had not been Alexander' etc. proves nothing as to a reference to the past. The utterance of Alexander necessarily refers to the moment when he makes the acquaintance of D. We have here to deal with a peculiarity of English idiom.

idea of relative numbers, I have examined five books, chosen at random. I hope the following statistics are approximately accurate:—

| | NORMAL INSTANCES. | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Reference to present time. | Reference to past time. | Doubtful. |
| <i>Catilinarian Orations</i> | I. 7, 17 (three examples) II. 6, 12 (possem) | None | |
| <i>Pro Murena</i> | § 4 (constitueretur: habitual) § 5 (confiterer) (defenderem) § 33 (esset: good instance) § 82 (posset) § 83 (posset: twice) | None | |
| <i>Pro Archia</i> | § 16 (ostenderetur) (peteretur) § 17 (possemus) § 29 (praesentiret) (terminaret) | None | |
| <i>Pro Sestio</i> | § 14 (vellem) | § 63 (expelleretur) (veniret: good instance) § 64 (vellent: cf. <i>Pro Cl.</i> 80) | § 81 (cogitaretis) § 134 (peccaret) |
| <i>Hor. Epist. Bk. I.</i> | 3, 26 (posses) 7, 93 (velles) 17, 13 (pranderet) 17, 14 (sciret: good instance) | | 17, 50 (posset) 19, 18 (pallerem) |

These results¹ coincide entirely with my general impression that sentences like *Pro Clu.* are quite exceptional. There is no doubt another class of sentences in which the Imperfect Subjunctive with past reference is much commoner: I mean those in which the Apodosis has the Pluperfect Subjunctive. In the Protasis the action is then marked as relatively present, i.e. contemporaneous with the action of the Apodosis: e.g. *De Amic.* 13 'quod non fecissent profecto, si nihil ad eos pertinere arbitrantur.'²

There is yet another set of instances in which the Imperfect refers to the past, i.e. those in which we have an Indicative in Apodosis, e.g. *De Amic.* 11 'Nisi enim immortalitatem optare vellet, quid non adeptus est, quod homini fas esset optare': here *vellet* refers indeed to the past, but it is not a case of

rejected supposition. Such cases demand further investigation. I have collected a few: *Caes. B. C.* iii. 44 'Pompeius prohibere non poterat nisi *vellet*,' etc.; *B. G.* vi. 34 'si negotium confici *vellet*, dimittendae erant plures manus; si continere ad signa manipulos *vellet*, locus ipse erat praesidio barbaris' (Madvig's rule, § 348, obs. 3 does not apply to the latter clause); v. 35 'sin autem locum tenere vellent, nec virtuti locus relinquebatur,' etc. (four other instances from *B. G.*); *Sen. Dial.* vi. 22, § 6 'Quid faceret? Si vivere *vellet*, Sejanus rogandus erat.'

I believe that one reason for the prominence given to the comparatively small number of instances referring to the past has been a difficulty in understanding how the Imperfect can refer to the present time. But this is a common feature of Indo-European languages in Conditional sentences with rejected supposition; as Mr. H. Bradley says (*Academy*, January 30, 1886), 'a tense inflection is made to do duty to express what is really a distinction of mood—or, in other words, a distinction affecting the class of the sentence...The condition is not *now* a true one, and so is referred to an imaginary past time, etc.' In fact a sort of 'Temptus-

¹ Cf. *Epist.* II. 2, 145 f. (*cupis* 148), *Virg. Aen.* XII. 810.

² Mr. Reid says on § 13: 'it does not often happen that the Apodosis has a verb in the Pluperfect, while the verb of the Protasis stands in the Imperfect.' I have however noted in the five books above referred to seven instances: *Cat.* i. 12, 29; ii. 2, 3: *Pro Sest.* 45; *Pro Mur.* § 8, § 17, § 46; *Pro Arch.* § 16. A large number are given by Priem (pp. 264 f.)

verschiebung' takes place: the Imperfect expresses the unreal supposition of the present, si scirem 'If I knew (which I do not)'; the Pluperfect expresses the unreal supposition of the past, si vidissem 'If I had seen (which I did not)'. In Latin and German we have also 'Modusverschiebung': in French not so.

But whatever the explanation, there can be no doubt of the fact. In the following instances all reference to the past is absolutely excluded:

(a) *Verr.* iv. 70 'si iudex non esses, te potissimum hoc petere oporteret'; *Leg. Agr.* ii. 85 'si ad vos esset singulos aliquid ex hoc agro perventurum, tamen honestius eum universi possideretis.'

(b) Reference to present shown by a preceding Present tense: *Verr.* ii. Lib. i. 70 'Non potest dicere, etc. Quae si diceret, tamen ignosci non oporteret'; *ibid.* iii. 91 'si id quod maxime vis, posses probare, etc., tamen hae pecuniae tibi damnationi esse deberent'; *ibid.* iv. 114 'neque haec externa vobis est religio: quod si esset, tamen... sancire vos velle oporteret'; *Pro Clu.* 183 'Hoc uno modo saepe veritas emergit quod aut ii, qui ad fraudem callidi sunt, non tantum audent, aut etc. Quod si aut confidens astutia aut callida esset audacia' etc. *Pro Planc.* 5 'Perdifficilis mihi defensionis ratio proponitur. Nam si tantummodo mihi necesse esset contra Laterensem dicere, tamen id ipsum esset molestum': *Pro Mil.* 10 'Quid gladii volunt? quos habere certe non liceret, si uti illis nullo pacto liceret.'

(c) Reference to present shown by a pronoun or adverb: *Verr.* ii. Lib. ii. 15 'si ita esset, tamen vos in hac quaestione audire oporteret'; *Pro Clu.* 18 'Hoc tempore sileret omnia' etc.; *Prov. Cons.* 47 'Si essent inimicitiae mihi cum Caesare, tamen hoc tempore

reipublicae consulere deberem'; *Pro Mur.* 33 'si mihi nunc de rebus gestis esset dicendum, plurima proelia commemorare possem'; *Phil.* iii. 33 'si tum illi respondere voluissem, nunc rei publicae consulere non possem'; *Phil.* iv. 1 'Quod si ante facere conatus essem, nunc facere non possem.'

IV. That the Imperfect Subjunctive is ordinarily the equivalent of the Greek Optative. This is distinctly asserted by Farrar (*Greek Grammar Rules*, § 93, eighteenth edition: 'εἰ τι ἔχοι, δίδοι ἄν if he were to have anything, he would give it: si quid habeat det, or more frequently si quid haberet, daret'). I think I have occasionally noticed the same view in commentaries and exercise books, though I do not know of any grammar that asserts it. To me this is tantamount to saying that the Imperfect ordinarily refers to the future. Is there really any justification for this view? Of course in suboblique and virtually suboblique clauses the Imperfect regularly represents a future tense ('docebat si Naturam sequeremur, nunquam nos aberraturos esse,' 'Si non periret immiserabilis' etc. and countless other instances). English here regularly uses *should*. Again in the *Apodosis* there may be said to be generally some kind of future reference (Madvig, § 347 b). Further I do not maintain that the Imperfect in Protasis *never* refers to the future: it may perhaps do so e.g. in *Hor. Od.* ii. 5, 21, *Epist.* i. 19, 18 (where Con. translates 'should my colour fail': here however I prefer Wilkins' rendering 'if I were pale' or else a reference to the past: cf. line 10), *Cic. Div. in Caec.* § 39 'si te natura adjuvaret.' But I maintain that this usage is so entirely exceptional that it ought to be excluded from school books.

E. A. SONNENSCHIN.

ARISTOPHANICA.

Ran. 86—88.

Dionysus, in accounting for his desire to bring back Euripides to the world above, says to Heracles that the good poets are all gone, and none save the poorest representatives of the art remain, the only respectable poet, Agathon, having gone to the luxurious court of Macedon, ἐς Μακάρων εὐωχίαν, 'to the blest—abroad.' Among other inquiries, Heracles asks where are Xenocles and Pythangelus, thus:—

ΗΡΑΚΛΑ. ὁ δε Ξενοκλῆς;
ΔΙΟΝ. ἐξόλοιτο νῆ Δία.
ΗΡΑΚΛΑ. Πυθάγγελος δέ;
ΔΙΟΝ. * * * * *
ΞΑΝΘΙΑΣ. περὶ ἐμοῦ δ' οὐδεὶς λόγος
ἐπιτριβομένου τὸν ὄμον οὕτως σφόδρα.

It is generally agreed that the words with which Dionysus receives the mention of Pythangelus have fallen out, and the text

is so arranged in the best editions as to indicate this lacuna. Presumably the reflection of Dionysus on Pythagoras was similar in purport to his remark on Xenocles. The dropping out of the verse would be accounted for, and the remark of Xanthias would gain point, if the lacuna were filled thus:—

ΗΠΑΚΑ. Πυθάγγελος δέ;

ΔΙΟΝ. *περὶ γε τοῦδ' οὐδείς λόγος*
πλὴν τοῦ Πυθριβείης.

ΞΑΝΘΙΑΣ. *περὶ ἐμοῦ δ' οὐδείς λόγος*
ἐπιτριβομένου τὸν ὄμον οὕτως σφόδρα.

Dionysus says there is nothing to say about him, but the well-known 'Attic shibboleth,' to which the poet elsewhere refers, *e.g. Thesm.* 557, *Av.* 1528, ἐντεῦθεν ἄρα τοῦ Πυθριβείης ἐγένετο.

308.

ὁδὲ δὲ δέσας ὑπερπεπυρρίασέ μιν.

The last word is usually changed to *συν*. But is not the text sound, the allusion being to the name of the speaker Ξανθίας?

346—348.

ἀποσειόνται δὲ λύπας,
χρονίους τ' ἐτῶν παλαιῶν ἐνιαυτοῦς,
ἱερᾶς ὑπὸ τιμᾶς.

The phrase ἐτῶν ἐνιαυτοῦς is 'a vile phrase.' The antistrophic word is *μύρτων*, hence Koch ὀστών, others ἰνῶν, γυίων, μελῶν. Would it not be better to transpose the τ' and read

ἀποσειόνται δὲ λύπας
χρονίους ἐτῶν παλαιῶν, ἐνιαυτοῦς θ',
ἱερᾶς ὑπὸ τιμᾶς.

The old men under the influence of the mystic Eleusinian rite shake off not only the whips and scorns of time, but the very burden of the years themselves. The corruption may have arisen from the fact that some copyist did not see that *χρονίους* agrees with *λύπας*. If it be held with most edd. that τ' ἐτῶν is corrupt, I would rather read:—

ἀποσειόνται δὲ λύπας
χρονίους, τηθῶν παλαιῶν ἐνιαυτοῦς,

'their old grandam years,' that is, 'years such as are attained by old grandams'; ἐνιαυτοῦς would be in apposition with *λύπας*, the years being themselves called 'heart-aches.'

572, 573.

ὡς ἡδέως ἂν σου λίθῳ τοὺς γομφίους
κόπτοιμ' ἂν οἷς μιν κατέφαγες τὰ φορτία.

Surely ἐκκόπτειν is the verb required. Read:—

ὡς ἡδέως ἂν σου λίθῳ 'κκόπτοιμ' ἐγὼ
τοὺς γομφίους οἷς κατέφαγες τὰ φορτία.

761.

νόμος τις ἐνθάδ' ἐστὶ κείμενος
ἀπὸ τῶν τεχνῶν, ὅσαι μεγάλαι καὶ δεξιάι,
τὸν ἄριστον ὄντα τῶν ἑαυτοῦ συντέχνων
σίτησιν αὐτὸν ἐν Πρυτανείῳ λαμβάνειν.

This is usually translated: 'there is a law here concerning such arts as are dignified and intellectual, that he who is best of his own fellow craftsmen should obtain free commons in the town-hall.' Now it seems to me very rash to ascribe here to Aristophanes an isolated usage of a common preposition which the commentators do not attempt to defend except by appealing to the language of Homer and Herodotus. To prove that ἀπὸ has the force of *περὶ*, Koch quotes *Il.* xxii. 126, οὐ μὲν πως νῦν ἐστὶν ἀπὸ δρυὸς οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης | τῷ δαριζέμεναι, where surely the prep. bears its ordinary sense of 'from.' Neither do the passages adduced from Hdt. seem to me by any means to justify a doctrine (which Liddell and Scott rightly, as I think, repudiate), that ἀπὸ has sometimes the force of *περὶ*. I think ταῦτα μὲν τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦτων τῶν ποταμῶν, Hdt. iv. 54, means, 'these are the accounts which reach us from these rivers' that is, 'these are the statements made by the people through whose countries these rivers flow.' The similar phrase τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς νήσου, iv. 195, should be explained in the same way. And surely in vii. 195, ἐξιστορήσαντες τὰ ἐβούλοντο πυθέσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς Ξερξέω στρατῆς, the meaning is 'the news from the army of Xerxes.'

Instead, therefore, of τῶν ἑαυτοῦ, where ἑαυτοῦ is mere surplusage, I would read τὴν ἑαυτοῦ (sc. τέχνην). The meaning would then be, 'There is a law here that out of all the fine arts, he who is best of his fellow craftsmen in his own art should have free commons.' 'The best of his fellow craftsmen' for 'better than any of his fellow craftsmen' is an idiom too familiar to require illustration. In addition to the great uncertainty whether ἀπὸ could have the force of *περὶ*, and could be so used by Aristophanes, the passage labours under another defect; the verses as they now stand would imply that the reward would go to him who was best in all the fine arts; whereas the meaning is that the man who had carried his art whatever it was (provided only it was a fine art) to the highest pitch of perfection should obtain the prize. The meaning ascribed to ἀπὸ in my version is quite normal, cp. Thuc. vii. 87, Hdt. vi. 27. Mr. Blydes reads ἐπὶ for ἀπὸ, disbelieving, no doubt, in ἀπὸ = *περὶ*.

819.

σκινδαλάμων τε παραξόνια, σμιλείματά τ' ἔργων.

Herwerden, *Hermes*, xvi. p. 352, admirably emends παραξόνα, which really has no meaning. He reads παραξόνα a word formed from παραξέω. The meaning would be 'shavings' or 'filings,' the very word required. The conjecture has not yet found its way into any edition.

ἐπειτ' ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων ἐπῶν οὐδὲν παρήκ' ἂν ἄργόν.

It has been suggested to read οὐδένα. But οὐδὲν ἄργόν means 'no shirking of work,' 'no case of idleness,' cp. Eur. *Bacch.* 262,

οὐχ ἔγνεις οὐδὲν ἔτι λέγω τῶν ὀργίων.

'I say there is no sound spot in the orgies,' it is all masqued licentiousness. So βροτῶν οὐδὲν μακαρίζω, Soph. *O. T.* 1196 and examples quoted by Jebb.

1028, 1029.

ἐχάρην γοῦν ἡνίκ' ἤκουσα περὶ Δαρείου τεθνῶτος,
ὁ χορὸς δ' εὐθὺς τὸ χεῖρ' ὠδὶ συγκρούσας εἶπεν ἰανοῖ.

This passage has been *varié vexatus*, but I do not think it has been yet emended. It is to be premised that the consideration of these verses is not complicated with the question whether there was a second edition of the *Persae*. For it is well-nigh incredible that a second edition could have so completely broken away from the lines on which the first edition was constructed as to introduce an announcement of the death of Darius. Therefore ἀπηγγέλη περὶ Δαρείου τεθνῶτος cannot be accepted. Not more satisfactory are the other *medelae* which have been proposed. Some of the latest texts give, or record with approval :—

ἐχάρην γοῦν τῇ νίκῃ ἀκούσας παρὰ Δαρείου τεθνῶτος.

On this I would ask, can any reader of the *Classical Review* adduce a metrical monstrosity parallel to that in the third foot of the verse so arranged—a dactyl cut with a trochaic caesura involving elision of a naturally long vowel before a short? But, waiving this question, we must remember that it is not when the ghost of Darius announces the future Grecian victory of Plataea that the chorus exclaim ἰανοῖ. It is when Xerxes announces and bewails the past Persian disaster of Salamis (*Pers.* 754, 966). I would therefore read :—

ἐχάρην γοῦν ἡνίκ' ἐκώκυσας, παῖ Δαρείου τεθνῶτος,
ὁ χορὸς δ' εὐθὺς τὸ χεῖρ' ὠδὶ συγκρούσας εἶπεν ἰανοῖ.

Darins often calls Xerxes παῖς ἐμός e.g. 739, 751, 782; κἀνακωκύσας λεγύ is said of Xerxes 468; cp. also 426, 427 :—

οἰμωγὴ δ' ὁμοῦ
κωκύμασιν κατέχευε πελαγίαν ἄλα.

I will add another conjecture more daring but nearer to the MSS. It is not impossible that the poet wrote :—

ἐχάρην γοῦν ἡνίκ' ἐκώκυσας, πόρι Δαρείου τεθνῶτος,

but though πόρις is applied to Epaphus by Aesch., and Eur. calls a girl πόρις, yet there is no certain warrant for πόρις 'son' or 'boy,' though such a term would be applicable to Xerxes, whose youth and vanity are throughout the *Persae* contrasted with the manly resolution of the dead Darius (see esp. 755). 1124.

πρῶτον δέ μοι τὸν ἐξ Ὀρεστείας λέγε.

Surely for τὸν we should read τῷ. How could the first verses of the *Choeph.* be called 'the prologue from the Oresteia?' While it is, of course, a prologue out of the Oresteia. Besides, the question was as to the Aeschylean prologue in general, and Eur. would not have indicated one particular prologue to serve as a test, but would have given to his rival some latitude of choice.

1298.

ἀλλ' οὖν ἐγὼ μὲν ἐς τὸ καλὸν ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦ ἤνεγκον αἰθε'.

The translation 'I transferred them from one honourable place to another' does not seem to have much point. If ἱμνοιοτρόφον is rightly explained 'rope-maker' in the verse before, I would propose to introduce a play on words by reading ἐκ τοῦ κάλω.

As the *Persae* has been introduced into the note on 1028, I may point out what seems to me a grave corruption in *Pers.*

163.

μὴ μέγας πλοῦτος κόνισας οὔδας ἀντρέψῃ ποδὶ ὄλβον ὃν Δαρεῖος ἦρεν οὐκ ἀνὲν θεῶν τινός.

I do not see how κόνισας can be explained. It is generally taken with οὔδας as if κόνισας οὔδας meant 'having careered over the plain.' But such a figure would be most unnatural—bloating wealth *career*ing over the plain as a prelude to kicking down the fabric of prosperity. Besides, οὔδας is not πεδίον, it is the 'ground, floor,' that low place to which one is dragged or hurled down, not that surface over which one careers. I would certainly take οὔδας with ἀντρέψῃ 'dash to the ground.' For κόνισας I have nothing better to suggest than γονῆς ἦς. I should much prefer a parti-

ciple having the same meaning as *παχυνθείς* (*Theb.* 771), but what participle is there of this meaning which could possibly be corrupted into *κοινίας*?

I add a few notes on the *Pax* and *Nubes*. *Pax* 129, 130.

ἐν τοῖσιν Αἰσώπου λόγοις ἐξευρέθη
μόνος πετεινῶν ἐς θεοὺς ἀφεγμένος.

This is said of the *κάνθαρος*. It strikes one at once as strange that the *κάνθαρος* should be classed among *πετεινοί*. But still stranger does this word appear when we read in the Scholiast's note that the fable told how the beetle made his way into the presence of Zeus to avenge himself on the eagle who had stolen his grubs, and taken refuge with Zeus. So the eagle, at all events, was there before him. Read *μόνος ἐπιγείων* which is very like in uncial letters. Cp. οὐ μόνον φντοῖς ἐγγείους ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ἐπιγείους ζῶις, *Plat.* 546 A.

741-744.

τοὺς δ' Ἡρακλῆας τοὺς μάττοντας καὶ τοὺς
πεινώντας ἐκείνους
τοὺς φεύγοντας κάσταταῶντας καὶ τυπτομένους
ἐπίτηδες
ἐξήλασ' ἀτιμώσας πρῶτος, καὶ τοὺς δούλους
παρέλυσε
οὓς ἐξήγον κλάοντας αἰεῖ.

Recent editors transpose the second and third verses of the above passage, apparently not finding the second verse applicable to the character of Heracles. But the passage of the *Ranae* beginning 549, shows Heracles as a robber and cheat, and 571ff, and again 605ff, show that Heracles was not regarded by the comic poets as out of the reach of personal violence. The words *τοὺς φεύγοντας* seem to me fatal to the proposed transposition, for Aristophanes would use *διδράσκω*, or some of the words akin to it, and not *φεύγω*, to describe runaway slaves: while *φεύγοντας* would suggest 'exiles' or 'defendants.' But Heracles was not above 'bolting,' as we may observe in *Ran.* 567,

ὁ δ' ὦχετ' ἐξέξας γε τὰς ψιάθους λαβόν.

However, perhaps for *φεύγοντας* we should read *φεύζοντας*, for *φεῦ* is an exclamation of anger as well as grief, and in the verse *Ran.* 562

ἐβλεψεν εἰς με δριμὺν κάμνκᾶτό γε

there may be a reference to a fierce *φενγμός*, not unlike the *μνγμός* and *ὠγμός* of the *Eumenides* of Aeschylus.

989, 990.

οἱ σοὺ τρυχόμεθ' ἦδη
τρία καὶ δέκ' ἔτη.

The Peloponnesian war cannot be said to have lasted thirteen years when the *Pax* was performed in 421. Perhaps under *τρία καὶ* is concealed some very rare word which has caused the corruption. Perhaps Ar. wrote *τρικακοὶ* or *τρικακῶς* in the sense of 'in desperate plight,' a word not found elsewhere but formed analogically with *τριδουλος*, *τριπρατός*, *τριθαλῆς*, *τριγέρων*. Or perhaps the comic poet here used a word found elsewhere only in late writers, and apparently applied to garments, *τριβακοί*, 'worn out.' I believe that the final syllables of *καρτερία* have in like manner given rise to a corrupt *τρία* in *Thuc.* ii. 65, where for *τρία μὲν ἔτη ἀντείχον* I have already proposed [*καρ*]τερία *μενετῇ ἀντείχον*.

1183.

ἔτα προσστάς πρὸς τὸν ἀνδριάντα τοῦ Παν-
δίωνος
εἶδεν αὐτόν, κάπορῶν θεῖ, τῷ κακῷ βλέπων
ὀπόν.

'He sees his own name down for service and dumfounded by his hard case—he runs'; whither? and what could be more unnatural than to run about aimlessly? I think we should read *ζεῖ*, a word appropriate to *ἀπορῶν*, instead of *θεῖ*. There is no trace of *θεῖ* in the Scholia; while *εἰς ἀμνηχανίαν καὶ ἀπορίαν περιίσταται* might well be a note on *ἀπορῶν ζεῖ*, *trepidans aestuat*.

Nubes 281.

ἵνα
τηλεφανεῖς σκοπιῶς ἀφορόμεθα
καρπύς τ' ἀρδομέναν ἱερὰν χθόνα
καὶ ποταμῶν ζαθέων κελαδῆματα.

The Cloud-maidens resolve to win their way from the bosom of Ocean to the summit of the lofty mountain, and then their song goes on in the words quoted. But they would fly to a mountain-top to look down on the earth, not to gaze at distant peaks. I would read:—

ἵνα
τηλεφανοὺς σκοπιῶς ἀφορόμεθα
καρπύς τ' ἀλδομέναν ἱερὰν χθόνα,
καὶ ποταμῶν ζαθέων κελαδῆματα.

'That from such a specular height we may look upon the earth teeming with fruit and the brawlings of the mighty torrents.' (Will any reader of the *Classical Review* suggest a translation for *ζαθέων*?). In the almost immediately succeeding verses we have the gen. *ιδέας* depending on the prep. in *ἀποσεισάμεναι*. Cp. *μοι παρορᾶς* = *ὁρᾶς παρ' ἐμοί* *Av.* 454.

1414, 1415.

καὶ μὲν ἔφην ἐλεύθερός γε κάγῳ
κλάουσι παῖδες, πατέρα δ' οὐ κλάειν δοκεῖς.

It is not likely that an iambic trimeter, even though a parody of an Euripidean senarius, would be introduced into a passage written in tetrameters catalectic. I do not think any of the words suggested to fill the *lacuna* (e.g. *προσθήκειν* or *σὺ χρῆναι*) are such words as

would have probably fallen out. I would suggest *δοκῶ γὰρ*, 'I think he should.' Its resemblance to the last words of the foregoing verse would account for its loss.

ROBERT Y. TYRRELL.

SOME SCHOOL EDITIONS OF GREEK PLAYS.

Sophocles for the use of Schools. Edited with Introductions and English Notes, by LEWIS CAMPBELL, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Greek in the University of St. Andrew's, and EVELYN ABBOTT, M.A., LL.D., Balliol College, Oxford. New and Revised Edition. In Two Volumes. Vol. I. Text. Vol. II. Explanatory Notes. 10s. 6d.

Editions of the Medea.

With Notes, by M. G. GLAZEBROOK, M.A., Assistant-Master at Harrow School. Rivingtons. 1886. 2s. 6d.

With Introduction and Notes, by C. B. HEBERDEN, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Brasenose College, Oxford. Part I. Introduction and Text. Part II. Notes. 1886. 2s.

Scholarum in usum edidit TH. BARTHOLD. (Metra recensuit W. Christ). Prague, F. Tempsky. Leipzig, G. Freytag.

In the new edition of Campbell and Abbott's 'Sophocles', the first volume includes with the text a full general introduction, comprising a life &c., and short articles on the grammar of Sophocles, the metres, and the MSS.; in the second volume with the notes are special introductions to each play, an index of Greek words, and a general index. The form of the book is neat, the execution careful, and the whole deserves a strong recommendation.

In the general introduction, under the head 'Improvements introduced by Sophocles into the Art of Tragedy', p. xi., is a statement which anticipates and corrects an error in the special introduction to the *Antigone*: 'While there are two actors only in the *Supplices* and *Persae*, and two alone speak, even if three are on the stage, in the *Septem contra Thebas*, three speakers are admitted in the *Oresteia*. In his later work, therefore, Aeschylus availed himself of the practice of Sophocles.' Here appears to be adopted the correct view, that in the closing

scene of the *Septem* Ismene remains on the stage and leaves it only at the end, though from the entrance of the herald she is silent; whereas in vol. ii. p. 94, 'the fact that Aeschylus in the *Septem* employs two actors only makes it necessary that Ismene should withdraw to make room for the herald, and thus we are left in uncertainty with regard to her action.' This inference, resting only on misconstruction of the phrase 'employment of two actors', cannot be true; it is unnatural and dramatically impossible that Ismene should quit the stage at the entrance of the herald, or at any time before the end of the piece, and there is no reason to doubt that she follows the bier of Eteocles, thus forecasting the contrast of character between the sisters, which is developed by Sophocles in the *Antigone*.

The section on grammar is interesting and good. Here and there a remark might perhaps be modified. 'The middle future for the passive is not uncommon.' This way of putting the matter is apt to dismay a learner, and confuse his notions of language. The truth is that in archaic Greek for many verbs the futures 'middle' and 'passive' are the same, like the presents. It is the later distinct forms for the future passive which are in tragedy to be regarded as 'peculiar': *φνλάξομαι*, *I shall be watched*, is as regular as *φνλάσσομαι*, *I am watched*. —The indicative with *ἄν* in *O.T.* 523, *ἦλθε τάχ' ἄν*, 'it may have come,' 'it probably did come', should not be marked as peculiar. It is as regular as the more common use to indicate that which would have happened but for interfering circumstances. The addition of *ἄν* merely shows that the past action was conditioned; whether the conditions were favourable or adverse is to be gathered only from the context. For examples see Krueger, *Greek Grammar*, § 392a, 4 and 5.—'In the use of the relative observe that *ὅστις* is used for *ὅς*, *O.T.* 1054, 1335, *Ai.* 1300.' This seems to be a mistake, and it is certainly not proved

by the references. In the first Oedipus is asking Jocasta whether the peasant already sent for is likely to be the person from whom the Corinthian messenger received the exposed child:—

γύναι, νοεῖς ἐκεῖνον, ὅτιν' ἀρτίως
μολεῖν ἐφίεμσθα; τόνδ' οὗτος λέγει;

The difference here between ὅτινα and ὅν is sensible enough, though perhaps not expressible; it is in full 'the man, however he is to be called, whom &c.', and imports both a certain impatience in the speaker and the fact that the person addressed is better informed. In the second—

τί γὰρ ἔδει μ' ὄραν,
ὅτω γ' ὁρώντι μηδὲν ἦν ἰδεῖν γλυκύν;—

if ᾗ had been used, we should more properly have said that it had the force of ὅτω, which is regular in a causal relative sentence, 'since seeing I could behold nothing of delight.' The third case is somewhat different—

ὅς ἐκ πατρὸς μὲν εἰμι Τελαμῶνος γεγώς,
ὅστις στρατοῦ τὰ πρῶτ' ἀριστεύσας ἐμήν
ἔχει ξύνεοννον μητέρα—

but neither here is ὅστις used indifferently. It is not simply 'who' but 'one that'. The point which Teucer makes is that the circumstances of the case prove the high distinction of his father, his mother having been given to the greatest soldier as such, ἐκείνῳ ὅστις ἡρίστευσε τὰ πρῶτα.

The introductions to the several plays are pleasant and useful reading. In that to the *Antigone* (vol. ii. p. 172) there are some very true remarks, which should be weighed before the Chorus of Greek drama is again spoken of as representing an ideal spectator. The Chorus of the *Antigone* might with more truth be described as a foil to the wit of a moderately appreciative audience. In the preface to the *Oedipus Tyrannus* (vol. ii. p. 1) there is one section which, I must confess, puzzles me. The editors apparently think that the horror of Oedipus at the discovery of his position is less easily intelligible to us than to the Greeks, and would help us to 'a simple and profound impression' by explanations which strike me as rather confusing. No doubt the action of Oedipus seems to us extravagant. So it did to the Oedipus of the *Coloneus*, and still more to the Eteocles of the *Phœnissæ*. But even this curious and rather interesting person does not find it unnatural. Nor, I suppose, do we.

It is plainly impossible to attempt here any extended discussion of the difficulties of Sophocles. The editors' notes appear to be

very complete; positive errors, it is perhaps needless to say, are very seldom to be found. In *O.T.* 22 'ἀγεν σαλεύει is fiercely tempest-tossed' misses the point; ἀγεν has the full sense *too much* and is closely connected with ᾗδῃ, omitted in the lemma of the note; the storm-beaten vessel can *now* sustain no more. On *O.T.* 281, 'οἷδ' ἄν εἰς no man whatever' would mislead a student; it should have been οἷδ' . . . εἰς; ἄν is of course constructed with the verb. Every book has a few slips of this kind, and here they are very few.

In revising the *Oedipus* plays the edition of Jebb has been used, but not in my judgment as fully by any means as it might have been. At *O.T.* 1091 the editors still give the MS. reading Οἰδίπουν and 'supply ἡμᾶς': Jebb's Οἰδίπουν is not, I think, even mentioned. It might have been adopted, at all events in a school-edition, where simplicity is desirable for its own sake. Later work, e.g. Whitelaw's papers in the *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, offer further material to be considered. But the book, as it is, is good, and well worth a place in a school-boy's library.

In spite of controversy there is at least one 'classical' masterpiece which does not seem to be losing its hold upon teachers and learners. This Review is hardly started, when already three small editions of the *Medea* are sent in, and the field is not unoccupied either in England or in Germany. But the *Medea* will support them all, and doubtless more, if more should offer.

Of the three, that of Mr. Glazebrook is certainly the most interesting, being in its form a more or less original experiment. In my own judgment it is also decidedly the best; but I am perhaps not an unimpeachable arbiter. The most marked differences between the two English editions proceed from a difference of view as to what a school-text should be. It is quite maintainable that an author like Euripides, depending on fair MSS., should for ordinary reading be printed without any change at all, plausible corrections (there is perhaps no such thing as a certain correction) being given, where desirable, in notes. And it is certain, that if conjectures are admitted at all, they must be admitted for various grounds in places not only construable but perfectly easy, as, for instance, where none of the MS. readings can be supposed the parent of the rest, and the original must therefore have differed from all. For school purposes, however, it is plainly needful that there should be both more change and less change. It is useless

to offer to a mind labouring at the elements sentences which one versed in the bye-ways of the language can just believe to have escaped the writer in a fit of subtlety or of negligence: and the discussion provoked by such passages conveys to the learner, if he reads it, nothing but vexation that he should be asked to learn what nobody seems to know. On the other hand, critical doubts are nothing to the beginner if they are not based on grammatical difficulty. The first and last requirement is a text beyond all question construable and explicable on common principles. A competent teacher will of course supply himself with critical materials, and use them as circumstances admit; but they are out of place in a class-book. All this may be commonplace, but it is only now obtaining an imperfect recognition. To take an instance: in *Med.* 1051, τῆς ἐμῆς κάκης, | τὸ καὶ προσέσθαι μαλθακὸν λόγους φρενί, the MSS. vary between φρενί and φρενός. Both give doubtful grammar and doubtful sense. Something of a case could be made for either, and the argument might be highly instructive to a professional scholar, whatever the value of the result. No one else has any interest in the MS. reading. Badham's προσέσθαι . . . φρενί removes all difficulty, and is, if any is, the received text. Mr. Glazebrook prints it and occupies the whole of his note with the explanation which, for most people, it requires. Surely this is the right way. Mr. Heberden, whose notes are of the old form, critical notes in miniature, prints προσέσθαι, and being thus involved in a discussion for which he has not room, is led into the statement, misleading if made without reserve, that 'προσέσθαι = to utter'. The sole practical effect of this discussion is to divert attention from προσέσθαι, which finally appears as a conjecture of 'much probability'. Teachers will judge how much consideration the ordinary student will give to a conjecture of 'much probability'. The net result is that, while the two editors are much of the same opinion, the one note will and the other will not convey that opinion to the intended reader; and these notes are a fair sample of the respective methods. Both as to readings and interpretations, Mr. Glazebrook makes it a first principle to avoid debate; and for the purpose in hand he is perfectly right. There should however have been an appendix—a page would be enough—stating the reading of the MSS. whenever it varies importantly from the printed text. Instead of this we have what is of little use, a list of emendations admitted in the text which

are not found in the edition of Prinz; and even this is incomplete; in 890, for instance, the text has χρῆ' ξομοιούσθαι, which, as I have the best reason for knowing, is not in the edition of Prinz.

Another unconventional and useful plan of Mr. Glazebrook's is the division of the play into acts and scenes, with head-notes, stage-directions, &c., like Mr. A. Sidgwick's, only on a more extended scale. It has even a certain scientific value, since it forces the editor and the student to imagine clearly the representation of the play, and thus brings out problems which are apt to be overlooked, but are not beyond the capacity of beginners. Thus Mr. Glazebrook is obliged to have a theory on a question commonly ignored, yet most important to the play,—at what time Medea prepares the poisoned gifts?¹ He places the preparation between v. 823 and v. 844—a solution not without difficulties, but perhaps as good as any. By the way, an 'entr'acte' cannot surely come in the middle of an 'act' (v. 1081); it is but a matter of form, but it ought to be put right. What is Mr. Glazebrook's authority for his 'curtain' (see final note)?

Mr. Glazebrook mentions Wecklein's edition and mine as those which he has chiefly used. Of my conclusions he accepts so many that I have little to say. When we disagree, it is generally on a matter not proveable any way. If I pressed for reconsideration, it would be on vv. 137–8, 194, 487, 581, 888, 942, 963, 1346 (common numeration). The note on Peirene (v. 69) is not accurate; and the statement (v. 314) that 'in Greek tragedy when women speak of themselves in the plural they use the masculine gender' is carelessly worded; it should be of course (as in Mr. Heberden's note) 'when a woman speaks of herself &c.' On vv. 738–9 Mr. Glazebrook improves a suggestion of mine by one (ἀντίθωο for ἀν πύθωο) which I should be glad to accept.

How far Mr. Heberden might agree with me I cannot say, for there is no reference in his book to any edition later than Wecklein's of 1880.

To the notes Mr. Heberden adds two Appendices: (1. *List of chief variations from the readings of the MSS.* 2. *On the Choral Metres*) and two Indices, Greek and English. The want of something answering to the first Appendix has been already noticed as a defect of Mr. Glazebrook's book. In the second Mr. Heberden has put very neatly and briefly as much about the general nature

¹ See the introduction to my smaller edition.

of the choral metres as his readers are likely to learn. Indeed his discretion in not attempting determinations for which there are no sufficient data might well be imitated in more ambitious works.

The German book is a text only, without explanatory notes. Below the text is a pretty full *apparatus criticus* of MS. readings and conjectures. With a class sufficiently advanced for critical work it might be used at the lesson; for preparation something else would of course be necessary. It is injured, I think, for its purpose by some strange licences. Surely it is not desirable to put into the text readings possible perhaps, but such as neither are established, nor are likely to be; as for instance at v. 11:—

ἀνδάνουσα μιν
[ῥ' περ μεγίστων ἐκ πόνων σώτειρ' ἔφν]
φυγῇ πολιτῶν τῶνδ' ἀφίκετο χθόνα.

The verse in brackets is invented to stop a gap, which most people do not suppose to exist, and τῶνδ' for ὧν is an alteration, to say the least, very uncertain. For a critical lesson a doubtful passage like this should be printed as in the MSS.—At v. 155 we have

εἰ δὲ σὸς πόσις
καινὰ λέχη σεβίζει,
σοὶ τόδε μὴ χαράσσου.

The MS. *κείνω* τόδε is probably wrong, but to call *κείνω* 'a gloss' is purely arbitrary, and, if the learner believes it, will prevent him from understanding what a gloss really is; nor do I see how the amended text can properly be translated.—The suggestion of ὡς φίλ' ἐγὼ προσανδῶ for ἔξω φίλα καὶ τὰδ' αὖδα (182) should have been made, if anywhere, certainly in the notes.—The interpretation of *γιγνώσκειν* καλῶς (228) as an infinitive absolute, before it is to be considered, must have better illustration than ὡς εἰπείν.—The best suggestion which I have noticed is *κόρη* for *πατρός* in 942 (943 spurious). But could *σὴν κόρη* mean 'thy bride'?—It would be a good service to print the *Medea*, or any part of Euripides, with a strictly conservative text and a complete *apparatus criticus*, in fact as Wecklein has printed Aeschylus. If the editor would bring his book nearer to this, it would, I think, be more useful than in its present shape.

A. W. VERRALL.

TEXTS OF CICERO.

M. Tulli Ciceronis libri qui ad rem publicam et ad philosophiam spectant; vol. ix. *Cato Maior de Senectute, Laelius de Amicitia*; 50 Pf. vol. x. *De Officiis*; 80 Pf. ed. Th. Schiche, Leipzig, Freytag.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes Selectae; vol. i. *Oratio pro Sex. Roscio Amerino*; 30 Pf. vol. ii. *In Q. Caecilium Divinatio, in C. Verrem Accusationis*, Lib. iv. v.; ed. H. Nohl; 80 Pf. Leipzig, Freytag.

THESE volumes are part of a *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum* now appearing under the general editorship of C. Schenkl, with whom at first J. Kvičala was associated. The series is especially intended for use in schools, and, for that purpose, will prove a formidable rival to the Teubner series of texts; for other purposes the two series do not come into competition. The volumes are printed in excellent type, and on paper pleasant to look at and to handle, though too thin, and the prices are extremely moderate. There is in each case a brief

introduction and a small *apparatus criticus* at the foot of the page, an advantage not possessed by the Teubner volumes, where the very full critical notes are placed apart from the text in the front of each volume. The editing is careful and competent. I have made a general examination of all the four books mentioned above, and have read carefully the editions of the *Cato Maior* and the *Laelius*. The names of the editors are well known to all who busy themselves with Ciceronian scholarship. It is a matter of course that opinions should differ as to the judgment exercised by an editor who is restricted to the selection of a very few topics for comment, whether the comment be critical or explanatory. The few criticisms therefore that I am about to offer must not be taken as detracting from the opinion I have already expressed as to the general value of the editions. Schiche has everywhere exercised sound and independent judgment. He is judiciously conservative and takes no notice of such extravagant *atheteses* as those put

forward by Lütjohann in a paper on the *Cato Maior* (*Rhein. Mus.* xxxvii.). Perhaps a few more indications might have been given as to the doubtfulness of MSS. readings which run counter to the ordinary grammar of Cicero. Thus e.g. in *Off.* 1, 73 *nihil minus* is very properly corrected, after Wesenberg, to *nihil m.*, but in 1, 116 *orti maioribus*, in 2, 75 *leges proximæ quæque*, and in 3, 106 *ne quaeratur latebra per iuriam* are left unnoticed; so too the subjunctive *agas* in *Cato Maior* § 27 (*deceat... quidquid agas agere pro viribus*) though very hard to justify, is left untouched.

Cato Maior § 4 *consolatio*: though this is the reading of the two best MSS., the context demands the *consolatione* of the secondary MSS.; Schiche has no n.—§ 13 *quarto nonagesimo anno*: the reading of P is more in accord with Cicero's usage than that of L, which inserts *et* after *quarto*.—§ 16 *etiam ipsius Appii extat oratio*: the MSS. reading is *et tamen*, and there is not the slightest reason for changing it. The sense is 'and apart from that,' 'and putting that aside,' and the usage is quite characteristic of Cicero; see the references in the note to the passage in my edition.—§ 27 *nec nunc quidem vires desidero adolescentis*: this compels us to take *nunc quidem* as = *viv γε* 'now at least,' which has the effect of making Cato imply that he does expect to regret the loss of his youthful strength when he is a little older. As this is contrary to the whole drift of the context, it is necessary to read with some MSS. *ne nunc quidem*.—§ 28 *est decorus senis sermo quietus et remissus*: Madvig's *seni* is not mentioned, though much preferable; cf. *Plin. ep.* 3, 1, 2 *senibus placida omnia et ordinata conveniunt*.—§ 49 *mori uidebamus in studio dimetiendi paene caeli C. Galum*: what sense can there be in saying 'we were accustomed to see C. Galus dying (by inches?) in his occupation of almost measuring out the sky?' MS. P omits *mori*; this in L has probably taken the place of *uiuere* which fell out owing to the similarity of its first letters to those of *uidebamus*. This suggestion has already been made by Iwan Müller, who refers to § 38 *in his studiis laboribusque uiuenti*.—§ 58 *natationes*: read without comment. As L has *aenationes* and P *nationes* with *ta* written over, my reading *uenationes* is as near to the MSS.; it is also more probable on other grounds.—§ 58 *id ipsum utrum libebit* (in a parenthesis): no note on this, though in Nauck, Sommerbrodt, and in my edition the difficulty of the reading is indicated. MS. P has *unum*, L *utrum*; both readings have arisen out of *ut* (which is in

the editio *Ascensiana*) to which *um* was added by dittographia from *ipsum*; the unintelligible *utum* then passed on the one hand into *unum*, on the other into *utrum*.—§ 73: in the bit from Ennius '*nemo me lacrimis decoret*' it is surprising to find no mention of Bergk's famous emendation '*dacrumis*.' Many scholars have raised doubts as to the true readings of the quotation from Ennius in § 14, but Schiche notices none of them.

J. S. REID.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta quae remanserunt omnia. Recognovit C. F. W. MUELLER. Partis ii. vol. iii. Leipzig, Teubner, 1886. 2 Mk. 10.

MUELLER's edition of Cicero is one of the most considerable recent works in the field of critical Latin scholarship. For knowledge, skill, industry, and conscientiousness there are few living scholars who can be placed in comparison with him. He founds his text, in the minutest matters as well as in the greatest, on the widest study of the peculiarities of Ciceronian MSS., and the most intimate knowledge of Ciceronian and general Latin usage. His critical notes do not merely record various readings; frequently by laborious collections of examples and by apt quotations or by suitable exegesis they justify the selection he has made. The net result is a fairly conservative text; but suspicious Latin is very seldom allowed to pass without warning. The present volume contains the twenty-seven speeches (including the *pro Scauro* and *pro Marcello*) which come last in order of delivery. To the 569 pages of text there are 129 closely packed pages of critical notes. A minute review of such a work could only take the form of something like a new critical edition of the speeches with which the editor deals. A very little examination of the book will convince a competent reader of its high value; he will then place it on his shelves as an indispensable adjunct to Baier and Halm (*Orelli ed.* 2). Mueller's edition does not entirely supersede this work, because, although he often uses MSS. which the former editors had not at hand, he has not space to give full collations. In connexion with many matters of Latinity affecting the text of other authors besides Cicero, Mueller provides material of great value. His own emendations are very few, and all of them simple and unpretentious. They are nearly all improvements on the readings of the MSS., but the passages are

generally of such a nature that it is possible to emend in many different and equally plausible ways. 'Facile est hariolari' says Mueller at one point, but it is often far from easy to urge cogent reasons in favour of one particular correction rather than others. In *Planc.* 91, Mueller's em. *recuso* for *desino* is really more probable than the ordinarily accepted *debeo*; *r* was first miswritten *d*, and the word then altered to the nearest compound verb with *de*;—a kind of error to which there are a good many parallels. In § 45 again, *bonorum omnium odium*, the word *odium* is a better correction of *vim* than *iram*; for *odium* being like *omnium* excepting one letter would easily fall out and be replaced by *vim*, and *ira* is generally used by Cicero either of the gods 'who do well to be angry,' or of reprehensible human passion; it is moreover rare in the speeches. Mueller is right in objecting to the phrase *oppido desperare* as un-Ciceronian in *Pis.* 84 *Thessalonicenses*, cum *oppido desperassent*, *munire arcem coeperunt*, but *de oppido* would be a more probable change than *oppido se defensores*.

I cannot follow our editor in his tendency to change all instances of *me te se* dependent on the genitive of the gerund, to *mei tui sui*. The accusative is, as is well known, a somewhat archaic usage. Can any one who has paid close attention to the rhythm and collocation of words in the Ciceronian sentence believe that *tui* was written in *De Orat.* 2, § 16: *ita sum cupidus in illa longiore te ac perpetua disputatione audiendi ut...*? Somewhat similar considerations apply to conjectures such as *salute danda* in *Lig.* § 9 for *salutem dando*.

A systematic and deliberate editor like Mueller naturally gets from time to time a little impatient with the 'glossesmatum venatores' as he once calls them, and he now and then cannot refrain from sarcastically indicating to them some prey which they have failed to mark. If one-tenth of the passages pounced on by the gloss-hunters as spurious were really so, then the gloss-makers were the most ingenious men of whom history has left any record. The art of constructing phrases which could be used like wedges to drive apart and yet hold tight the words of the real text must have been one of inconceivable nicety. A patient examination of the text of Cicero conducted by a competent scholar who has read and re-read his author from end to end must lead to a conviction that the deliberate interpolations are very few and far between, and that the number of those which are due to accident is in-

definitely smaller than has been supposed by a large number of recent critics. Some of Mueller's remarks bearing on this subject are much to the point. On a proposal to eject some words in *Sest.* § 6 he exclaims: 'miram sedulitatem hominum talia inculcantium!' Here again is a lesson much needed by the critics of Cicero's text who will not see to what shifts an advocate with a bad case must needs be sometimes driven: 'quam inani verborum sonitu, quam futili ac paene absurdo argumentandi genere saepe Cic. usus est, credere nolunt viri docti.' Again: 'si ita scripsit Cic., non laudo, sed multo tamen melius scripsisse contendo quam quae viri docti substituerunt.'

The following remarks concern entirely the *Pro Sestio* and the *Pro Balbo*, speeches which I have had occasion to study minutely and recently. The consideration of the *Pro Sestio* brings home the fact, too often forgotten, that Cicero has, even in his speeches, many markedly different styles. What greater contrast could there be than that between the laboured, mechanical and rhetorical, but often grand, rolling and imposing periods of the *Pro Sestio*, and the brief, pointed, pithy sentences of the *Second Philippic*, which make straight for the throat of the antagonist (to use a pleasant phrase not uncommon in the ancient rhetorical schools)? Those critics who will not take account of contrasts such as these must of necessity often go astray. The speech for Sestius was evidently written and re-written and corrected a score of times over, and the uneasy conscience of the author has clouded it with obscurity and artificiality.

Sest. § 5 *si modo id consequi potero*. Müller wishes to insert *dicendo* before *consequi*, but the phrase as it stands is a set one and recurs frequently with slight variations, such as the omission of *id* or the substitution of *potuero* for *potero*. Five exx. are given in my n. on *Acad.* 1, § 8; of course *Imp. Cn. P.* § 2 *si quid in dicendo consequi possum* is different.

§ 16 *omni inaudita libidine insani*, MSS.; for the last word *exsangui* (adopted by M.), *infamis*, *exhausti*, *enervati* etc. have been conjectured. Rather *insanientis*.

§ 17 *proditores*: I still hold *perditores* to be a necessary alteration, for reasons given by me in Dr. Holden's edition *ad loc.* The admirable work of Dr. Holden seems not to have been in Mueller's hands.

§ 22 *sermonis ansas dabit*: there seems to be no reason why *sermonis* (altered by M. and most edd.) should not stand as a defining genitive to *ansas*.

§ 24 ita domus ipsa fumabat ut multa eius tsermonis indicia redolerent: read *sermone sane digna redoleret*.

§ 42 effusam illam ac superatam Catilinae...manum: M. with nearly all editors changes *superatam*; but surely Cicero may be allowed to speak of Catiline's force as having been 'routed and overcome,' as he speaks elsewhere of a fleet having been 'conquered and overcome' (victa atque superata, *Verr.* 2, 5, 98). Whether he wrote *effundere manum* for *fundere* is far more doubtful, though the question is, I think, unnoticed by the editors. *Effusam* probably is for *ecfusam*, and the *ec* is a dittographia of the *et* which precedes it. So in § 91 *ex feritate* passed into *ex efferitate* and *ex efferitate*.

§ 50 ille (Marius) vitam suam...ad rei publicae fatum reservavit: *fatum* is the generally accepted emendation of Pantagathus for *ratum*; but *rectionem* (which I conjectured *ap.* Holden) gives better sense and would easily, by the dropping of the *c*, and the writing of the final syllables by contraction, pass into *ratum*. *Rectio* is twice joined with the gen. of *res publica* elsewhere in Cic.

§ 70 Lentulus...causam suscepit: Mueller in an excellent note defends *causam* 'the cause' against Halm who reads *meam causam*. His defence of the greatly disputed words in the next §, viz. *ingredior iam* in *Sesti tribunatum*, is equally good.

§ 77 commodum aliquo proposito (not in MSS.) aut largitione: rather insert *ostentata* after *largitione*, comparing *Leg. agr.* 2, § 10.

ib. nulla contione advocata, nulla lata lege concitatam nocturnam seditionem quis audivit? *Lata* is not in the MSS. and is unsuitable for the reason I urged in Dr. Holden's edition, that the turmoil might be expected to arise before the law was passed or while it was being passed, not after it had passed. Either *recitata* (in the codex *Gemblacensis*) or *promulgata* (*Lambinus*) is preferable.

§ 84 quid uti faceret? senatum obsideret...? Certainly *ut* must have fallen out after *senatum*.

§ 110 nihil saneate libelli: this, the reading of P, points to *nihil sani e libellis*; with the *e* was combined a variant *a*, and *ae* altered to *a te*. I do not see why Mueller should take account of the words *iuabant anagnostae* inserted before *libelli* in some recent corrected MSS., which lead him to the conjecture *nihil suavitates iuabant anagnostae*. I am glad to see that he

defends *philosophorum reculam* in the same §.

§ 133 ut illius meae proscriptionis.. tubam Vatinium, sese scriptorem esse diceret: *tubam Vatinium*, *sese* is an acute em. of M. for the *toumbuam essese* or other like nonsense of the MSS., and I have no doubt that the idea of it, if not the precise form, is right. M. does not quote *Fam.* 6, 12, 3 *tuba belli ciuilis* (applied to *venia*).

§ 137 splendorem confirmare: this is the conjecture of Bake, adopted by Mueller tacitly. It is one of the few instances of any importance in which he has abandoned the MSS. without indicating the fact. *Senatum proximorum ordinum splendore confirmari voluerunt* is really better Latin and more likely to have been written by Cic. than the correction.

Pro Balbo § 3 recte se dare: M. adopts this conj. of Madvig, but I am convinced that *omnia recte se dant* is not Ciceronian Latin; see the note in my edition, p. 102, which was not in Mueller's hands while his text was being printed; but he courteously quotes it in his preface.

§ 5 Carthagine esse opsessum: M. adopts (as I did) this em. of Madvig, but without comment. The reading to which the MSS. point is *Carthaginem isse possessum*, and this may after all be right. *Possidere* is certainly used of lands or places taken from the enemy; cf. *e.g.* *Mur.* 34 *posse regno*; *Tac. An.* 14, 21 *Achaia, Asia...possessa*; *Plin. n.h.* 4, 39 *toto oriente possesso*. For the supine with *ire* cf. *Cic. Att.* 8, 4, 3 *Brundisium ire desertum* (of Pompey); *Caes. b.g.* 5, 26, 2 *Treveri magna manu ad castra oppugnatum venerunt* (where the *ad* should probably be ejected). But it may be urged that though the general or the whole army may be said to have proceeded to occupy Carthage, the phrase is not suited to an individual of inferior rank. *Velleius*, however, says of one of his ancestors (2, 16, 2): *tantam fidem praestitit ut...Herculaneum cum T. Didio caperet, Pompeios cum L. Sulla oppugnaret, Comp-samque occuparet*. Even if *posse* were changed to *opse*, I should prefer to keep *Carthaginem isse*, comparing *Sall. Jug.* 103, 1 *Marius proficiscitur in loca sola obsessum turrim regiam*. I may mention that there is no record in the historians of any siege of Carthago nova at the time indicated, which must be (if Cic. can be trusted) prior to the battles of the Suero and the Turia. Nor is it likely from the circumstances of the war that any such siege took place. Possibly *Carthaginem* is an error for *Calagurrim*. The forces of Pompeius did besiege this town

just before the battles (Liv. *Epit.* 93) but were driven away by the Sertorians.

§ 6 *pietas in rem publicam*: this conjecture (for *tas* in etc. of MSS.) which I put forward in my edition, has, I am glad to see, been arrived at and adopted independently by Mueller.

§ 11 *ille ille vir*: Madvig, on the strength of inferior MSS. ejected one *ille* and Mueller follows him wrongly. The repetition is quite in Cicero's style, as is shown by Jordan on Caecin. § 14.

§ 26 *nihilo magis* (Lambinus for *nihil m.*): Mueller is right in adopting this; Cicero no more said *nihil magis* than he did *multum magis*; nor, I may say, did any other Latin writer of repute; see my note on *Acad.* 2, § 58. *Nihil minus* has been generally abandoned in *Off.* 1, § 72; that passage and this are, I believe, the only two in Cicero where good MSS. give *nihil* with a comparative.

§ 39 *qui...ab omni studio sensuque Poenorum mentes suas ad nostrum imperium nomenque flexerunt*: I venture to think that these much disputed words are given correctly in the MSS. Why may not *sensus Poenorum* mean 'feeling for their fellow-Punians,' if Cicero can write, as he does, *virtutis certamen for certamen contra virtutem*, and *dissensio huius ordinis for d. ab hoc ordine*? So Justin 29, 4, 5 has *Romanorum bella* for *bella in Romanos*. For the general drift cf. Val. M. 7, 3, 7 *animum suum a Poenis ad Romanos coegit revocare*; Liv. 5, 42, 8 *abalienaverant ab sensu rerum suarum animos*.

§ 47 *si tanta bella attigisset quanta gessit et confecit* (sc. Marius): *attigisset* is an infelicitous correction of *egisset*. I have not the slightest doubt that the old em. *legisset* is correct; there is an allusion to the tradition that Marius used to pour ridicule on the generals who learned their art from books. See Sallust *Jug.* 85, and the references in my note on *Acad.* 2, § 2.

ib. *a re publica bene gerenda impediretur*: I cannot think it possible (as Mueller does), that Cic. would construct *impedire* with the simple ablative, omitting the preposition.

§ 48 *cum...quaestio venisset*: the use of *venire* 'to come about' (in other than future tenses) to which Mueller objects, is rare but well attested; cf. *Imp. Pomp.* 15 *cum venit calamitas* (left unchanged by M.). The passage given by Georges: '*haec ubi veniunt*' seems to come* from *Verr.* 2, 5, 12 where the best MSS. have *eventiunt*.

ib. *ternos: trecenos* is proposed by Ihne *Hist. V.* 163 (Eng. ed.), not noticed by M. Ihne's long argument seems to me baseless.

§ 50 *Avennensem foederatum*: for the unintelligible *Avennensem* I propose *Vasiensem*, a word which occurs in inscriptions to designate a citizen of Vasio, one of the two chief towns of the Gaulish Vocontii, who were certainly *foederati*. *Viennensem*, of which I formerly thought, will not do because the Allobroges were *dediticii* not *foederati* (Liv. *epit.* 61, Strabo 4, p. 203).

J. S. REID.

THE VIENNA CORPUS SCRIPTORUM ECCLESIASTICORUM LATINORUM.

I.

Eugippii *Excerpta ex Operibus S. Augustini*, ed. P. Knoell, Vienna, 1885. 22 Mk.

It is a striking proof of the immense resources of Germany that, besides all the activity expended upon the Classics in the stricter sense, there should be carried on at one and the same time three such undertakings as the *Vienna Corpus Script. Eccles. Lat.*, the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, and the collection of materials for *Latin Lexicography* in Professor Wölfflin's *Archiv*. It is true that the last-mentioned, after being conducted for three years on a subsidy from the Munich Academy of £25 per annum, seems to be on the point of expiring; NOS. V. & VI. VOL. I.

but the wonder is rather that it should have gone on so long as it has. An Englishman cannot help asking what we have at all parallel to any one of these enterprises. I am afraid that Dr. Murray's great *Dictionary* is all that we can show; and that belongs to a different sphere. Yet systematic undertakings of this kind react upon the nation that gives birth to them. Besides the positive results obtained, they serve to train and practise a whole army of collators and editors who are ready to turn their hands to anything, and who have gained their experience not at second-hand or by mere theorising, but by direct work at MSS. and texts. In saying this I do not of course mean to imply that I regard the Germans as infallible: the present article

will show that I do not: but they at least make the best use of their *personnel*.

The *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* is to South Germany very much what the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* are to North. It was planned rather more than twenty years ago by the Vienna Academy on the most comprehensive scale. The writings which it was proposed to edit were those of the Latin Fathers down to the seventh century. Competent scholars were sent out to examine the contents of the different European libraries, so as to see what MSS. were available. The result has been a series of reports, the first of which was, I believe, that by Halm on the libraries of Switzerland in 1865, with a supplement by Morel in 1867. In 1870 and 1871 came out in two volumes Reifferscheid's elaborate account of his explorations in Italy. Compared with this the report by Zangemeister on England, which appeared in 1877, was rather slight and perfunctory. The last report, that on the Spanish libraries, has been published within the last few weeks after having previously appeared in the *Sitzungsberichte*. It is edited by Hartel from materials mainly collected by that promising scholar, whose early decease was so much to be regretted, G. Loewe. France was also included in the original programme, but no report on the French libraries has yet been issued: so much excellent work has been done of late in the way of cataloguing by the French themselves that any foreign report might well be thought unnecessary.

These reports formed a sort of chart to direct the labours of the scholars who undertook the task of collating and editing. The series of published volumes was opened with Sulpicius Severus by Halm, which appeared in 1866. It has been followed since that time by thirteen more—counting the second part of Eugippius, and the three parts of Cyprian as single works. At the end of the list comes the so-called *Speculum* of S. Augustine which is only just out.

Compared with the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* the Vienna volumes are not quite so sumptuous and exhaustive, but they have the advantage of being handier and cheaper. It may be mainly due to natural development, but it is also perhaps in part owing to a generous rivalry that in the later issues the indices and prefaces have become fuller and more complete. Many of the editors have taken occasion from time to time to give a detailed account of their critical procedure in the *Sitzungsberichte* or *Transactions* of the Vienna Academy. The series has also led

to the production of valuable essays on the language of the authors edited, as by Engelbrecht on Claudianus Mamertus in the *Sitzungsberichte* for 1885, and by Hartel on Lucifer Calaritanus in the last volume of the *Archiv f. lat. Lexikographie*.

Critics are rather in the habit of complaining that the writings which have so far been published, with the single exception of Cyprian, all belong to the second or third rank: the texts of Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Hilary, Tertullian, are still advertised as in the stage of 'preparation.' But we may well be grateful for what we have got, and leave the editors to take their own time. Many considerations determine the rate at which it is possible to issue the works of any particular author, even supposing that all the editors had the same amount of time at their disposal. For instance, it was one thing to edit Lucifer from a single MS. in a volume of some 330 pages, and another thing to edit Eugippius' *Excipits from S. Augustine* which extend to 1,100 pages, and for which there are more MSS. than any editor was likely to collate. However, the line is now rapidly lengthening, and the volumes have of late appeared in such quick succession that we may hope to receive some of the greater works before long.

I propose in the articles of which this is the first, to notice some of the more recent volumes, not necessarily in the order in which they have appeared, and also not necessarily in any order of interest. In this respect the book which is now before me—substantial as it is—may not appear very promising. There is none which has met with so grudging a reception. Eugippius' *Excipits from S. Augustine* are of course at best only a secondary work. Their popularity in the Middle Ages, which is evidenced by the number of MSS. that have come down to us, was naturally accounted for by the convenience of having the cream of S. Augustine's bulky tomes in a single volume. The works of S. Augustine circulated in sections, but even so it is a wonder that the endurance of the scribes was equal to the task of transmitting them to posterity. We can imagine that Eugippius must have earned a large debt of gratitude by compressing these into the equivalent of 1,100 printed pages. And yet the extracts are not such as we should make now, and they are not likely to be much used for their original purpose. Their real interest lies in the help which they afford towards reconstructing the text of S. Augustine. We

will reserve our remarks on the personality of Eugippius until we come to speak of the *Vita S. Severini*, his other extant work. Suffice it to say at present that his *Selections* were probably made within a hundred years of the death of S. Augustine; so that by bringing out a revised text of Eugippius the Vienna editors have thrown up, as it were, an advanced work from which to lay siege to the great African.

The MSS. which Knoell has used for his edition are these:

- A* = Cod. Ambrosianus, saec. ix., two rather long fragments.
D = Cod. Desnoyersii, saec. viii., about half the work.
G = Cod. Sangallensis, saec. ix., the whole.
M = Cod. Cheltenhamensis (Mediomontanensis), saec. viii., all but complete.
P = Cod. Parisinus (Sangermanensis), saec. ix., complete as it stands, but with a few pages made up by the next MS., *Q*.
Q = the six last leaves of *P* which really belonged to another MS. of about the same date.
T = Cod. Parisinus (Tellerianus), saec. ix., like *D*, about half the work.
V = Cod. Vaticanus, saec. vii., the whole except a small portion at the beginning and end.
v = Cod. Vercellensis, saec. x., nearly the whole.

Knoell makes slight use of two other MSS. and gives an account of some more. Among these is a Bodleian MS. of the ninth century, which Knoell dismisses as *nullius in momentis*. I was anxious to test this, but unfortunately the MS. contains only the latter half of the *Extracts*, and the quaternion, which should have contained the passages from the *De Civitate* which I have used as a criterion, is missing.

Of the MSS. just enumerated several have an interest quite apart from their text. *T*, from the beauty of its execution, is one of the exhibited specimens in the Bibliothèque Nationale: *V* is also highly praised for its calligraphy. *D* was made the subject of a most instructive memoir (*Notice sur un Manuscrit Mérovingien d'Eugippius*, Paris, 1875) by the accomplished librarian M. Léopold Delisle. It is one of the best typical examples of Merovingian writing, as it contains a number of different hands—uncial, half-uncial, minuscule, and cursive. The fragment *Q* has a subscription which

has attracted much attention. This has evidently been handed on from the original from which *Q* itself was copied. We gather that the MS. to which it relates was written by Peter the notary for Redux, Bishop of Naples, in the year 581 A.D., while the Lombards were besieging the city of Naples.

What use, it will be asked, has Knoell made of these materials? The reply to this question will naturally touch upon four points: (1) the selection of MSS., (2) the collations, (3) the principles followed in the construction of the text, (4) the bearing of the text so constructed upon that of S. Augustine.

The MSS. fall into two strongly-marked groups, *MQV* on the one side, *DGPTv* on the other: *A* alone seems to stand somewhat apart, though as its text is not extant along with *T*, I have not made it the subject of close analysis. Now of these MSS. *M* is simply a direct copy of *V*, and Knoell believes that *v* was copied (apparently at one or two degrees' remove) from the same original as *G*. It is true that *M* is of use in helping to discard the corrections of *V*, which had not been made when it was written, and *v* performs a like office in regard to *G*, with the first corrector of which it is closely allied. Still I cannot but think that some of the labour (by no means slight) which has been spent on these two MSS., *M* and *v*, might have been spared. There are two ways in which the economy might have been utilised. It is part of the general plan of reducing, as much as possible, the *apparatus criticus* in the Vienna series, that the authorities are usually cited on one side only. This is, however, often unsatisfactory. It is a precarious method to leave the reader to infer readings *ex silentio*. This must of course be done in many cases, if the volumes are to be kept down to a moderate size and price, but it would have been a decided advantage if these cases had been fewer than they are. Or, on the other hand, in place of *M* and *v*, it might, perhaps, have been possible to find a MS. representing a more distinct type of text, the combination of which with the other MSS. might have been helpful. The mechanical rule of drawing a line at the tenth century is sure to lead to regrettable omissions.

There is another point on which I cannot quite satisfy myself as to the method of collation. No doubt great allowance must be made for an editor who has collated—not everywhere but very largely—as many as nine MSS. for a text covering 1,100 pages. So long as we know what MSS. are being

collated, and what inferences may be drawn from silence, all is well. But this is not always the case. Knoell says expressly that he has collated *G* for the first twenty-nine chapters; and citations of *G* are often very frequent. But on pp. 150-155 *G* is not cited at all; on p. 154 it is cited twice; on pp. 157-164 it is again not cited, and on p. 165 it is again cited twice; yet it does not appear that there are *lacunae* in the MS. What are we to make of this? The student who wants to determine the exact relation of *G* to *DPTv* finds himself baffled.

The main question, however, of course is that as to the construction of the text. Knoell refers to his intention to explain the principles of his procedure elsewhere. I have not been able to ascertain whether this intention has been fulfilled. Knoell has based his text mainly upon *V*, which certainly has a *prima facie* case in its favour. It is by a little the oldest of the MSS.: it has preserved some spellings like *Vergilius*, and still more vernacular forms—*de non fuerit, erat de, quinta triena*—which seem to have been lost in the other MSS.: and it

gets the benefit of the subscription in *Q* which must have been taken from a MS. of the same type. And yet there is, I cannot but think, one serious difficulty to be got over—a difficulty with which I cannot feel sure that Knoell has thoroughly grappled.

In seeking to check the text of Eugippius one naturally goes first to S. Augustine, and in particular to that treatise which has had at least a preliminary critical edition, the *De Civitate* of Dombart (Leipzig, 1877). The MSS. used by Dombart are nearly as old as those of Eugippius: *V* is of cent. vii., (*C*, which is also of cent. vii., is unfortunately only extant in a passage corresponding to one short extract in Eugippius), *K* is of cent. viii., *F* of cent. ix., *AR* of cent. x. Now on comparing the text of these MSS. with the MSS. of Eugippius I find that they constantly support the group *DGPTv* against *MV* which Knoell has followed. I will give in parallel columns some of the results of this comparison, showing what MSS. of Eugippius agree with the text or leading MSS. of Augustine:

EUGIPIUS ED. KNOELL.

- p. 52, 25, autem
53, 26, uoluptatem
54, 1, quia
3, enim *MV*
55, 22, litteras sacras
56, 14, redemptionem
18, refrigescit = Aug. *cod. V*
atque ita = Lat. Vet. *cod. f*, Matt. xxiv. 12
22, decipimus, *MV*
57, 10, temptationibus uariis
16, gloriabitur
58, 2, timorem
20, eas
24, dixit
59, 7, exspectamus
26, atque iustorum multumque sanctorum
27, quia
77, 14, est *sine addit.*
78, 2, ex mortuis
25, atque, *MV*
151, 24, requies
156, 3, maior
159, 4, fecit Deus
7, aut impossibile
10, priorum
11, Dei uerbo
172, uoluntatem aliquam
173, 20, affectos
174, 12, quia
175, 1, specie
23, pulchritudinis suauium corporum, *MV*
176, 7, deriuatur, *MVU*
23, illo, *MV*
177, 2, ille eos
178, 4, mortaliter, *MV* = Aug. *cod. A*, *ed. Paris*.

De Civitate ED. DOMBART.

ergo = Eugip. *codd. DGPTv*
uoluptates = *D²GPTv*
quae = *DGPTv*
autem = *DGPTv*
sacras litteras = *DGPTv*
redemptionem = *DGPTv*
refrigescet (*Domb.*) = *P²T*
atque ita = Lat. Vet. *codd. abd²c*, Matt. xxiv. 12
seducimus = *DGPTv*
temptationes uarias = *P²PT*
glorietur = *DGPTv*
timores = *DGPTv*
om. = *DGPTv*
dixerit = *DGPTv*
speramus = *DGPTv*
multumque iustorum atque sanctorum = *DGPTv*
quoniam = *DGPTv*
a/d. mediator bonus = *DGPTv*
et ex mortuis = *P²Tv*
et = *DGPTv*
et requies (Aug. *cod. V*; sed *Domb.*) = *PTv*
longe maior = *PTv*
Deus fecit = *PTv*
aut etiam impossibile = *PTv*
priorum = *PTv*
uerbo Dei = *PTv*
aliquam uoluntatem = *PTv*
affectos fuisse = *PTv*
qui (Aug. *codd. VA, Domb.*) = *PTv*
in specie = *PTv*
pulchrorum suauiumque corporum *PTv*
deprauatur = *P²T*
ab illo = *PTv*
eos ille = *PTv*
Mutabiliter (Aug. *codd. VG, Domb.*) = *P(T)v*

Our attention is caught by the coincidence of Knoell's reading *refrigescit*, p. 56, 18 with

that of the Italic text represented by *f* (Cod. Brixianus), and we at once remember

the well-known passage in which Augustine expressed a preference for that text. Too much stress, however, must not be laid upon this point. S. Augustine's Bible is a very variable quantity, and by his time the Latin texts had been much mixed. I have not as yet formulated any conclusion as to the text used in the *De Civitate*. There are certainly Italic readings, such as *glorificent* in the quotation of Matt. v. 16, *recordatus* in the quotation of Matt. v. 23. But there are also readings which are not Italic: e.g. *mundo corde* (from Matt. v. 8 = Lat. Vet. Codd. a, b), seems to have better attestation in both the places where it occurs, as against *mundi corde* of *f*. Another reading where there might seem to be a certain presumption in favour of Knoell's text is *deriuatur* in 176, 7, where the editor aptly compares the use of *deriuatio* in Victor Vitensis and Orosius: yet here too the MSS. of Augustine

unanimously present *depravatur*, and it is equally possible that *deriuatur* may be a paraphrastic expression introduced in the process of copying. Whichever type of text is the genuine Eugippius, evidently by Eugippius himself or by a subsequent scribe such paraphrasing must have taken place to a considerable extent. In most of the other instances that are not simply ambiguous I should have thought that, even apart from the evidence of the MSS. of Augustine, the internal probabilities were rather against the text adopted by Knoell.

It is right to set down on the other side those readings in the passages previously analysed in which Codd. *PTv* &c. of Eugippius differ from the MSS., or from Dombart's text of Augustine. For a reason which I shall state presently I only give those combinations into which *T* enters.

EUGIPII codd. *PTv*, &c.

- p. 53, 6, Virgilius, *D^gMP^tv* (cf. p. 487, 11, v, p. 538, 3, *GPTv*)
16, suscipiunt, *DGP(T)v*

54, 2, caliginosis, *G²Tv*

57, 14, pereant, *D^gGPTv*

[There is some confusion and mixed agreement and disagreement of the different texts here.]

58, 8, sui, *DGP^tv*, Knoell; ei, *Mv*

16, actiones, *DG¹PTv*

59, 19, contigit, *PT*

77, 23, beatitudine, *D¹T¹*

156, 18, aerium, *PTv*

172, 26, sed si superior *PTv* = Aug. ed. Paris.

174, 27, uellet, *P²T*

32, scire, *P²Tv*

175, 28, luxuria, *PT* (cf. *Speculum Augustini*, p. 639, 14, ex Ep. Jac. v. 5)

[One or two instances of the omission or insertion of final *m* have not been noted on either side.]

There will hardly, I think, be any question which of these two lists is the more important. Nor can it, I imagine, any more be doubted that on the whole the text of *PTv* and their allies is nearer to that of the MSS. of Augustine than the text of *MV*. But considering that the work of Eugippius is professedly a reproduction of Augustine's text it seems to me distinctly more probable that those MSS. of Eugippius are right which are in agreement with that text. The only other possibilities are (1) that the Augustine MSS. on their side are all corrupt—which may be practically dismissed; or (2) that the copies used by Eugippius within a hundred years of the death of S. Augustine were already corrupt or were dealt with freely by Eugippius,

De Civitate ed DOMBART.

Vergilius = Knoell

suspiciunt = Knoell (dispiciunt Verg. edd. [despiciunt codd. opt.; respiciunt codd.])

caliginosi = Knoell

pereunt = Knoell

om.

affectiones = Eugip. codd. *G²v*, Knoell

contingit = Knoell

beatitudini = Knoell

aerium = Knoell

sed superior = Knoell

uelit = Knoell

sciri = Knoell

luxuria = Knoell

and that a later copy—the parent MS. of *DGPTv* which may well have been as old as the ancestor of *MV*—was systematically corrected into agreement with the Augustine MSS. The first half of this second alternative is possible enough in either of its forms: the history of the text of the New Testament shows that a hundred years is quite long enough to let in a great amount of corruption; and an editor like Eugippius would be, perhaps, more likely to resort to paraphrase than a scribe who was trained to copy mechanically what he had before him. But the further assumption which is necessary to complete this alternative, that the text of Eugippius was deliberately harmonised with that of Augustine, seems to me by no means probable. So far as I have

been able to judge, the phenomena are the same all through Eugippius; but if so, the corrector must have had access to a complete collection of the works of S. Augustine, which must have been in itself an exceptional thing; and then we must remember that he would have no such convenient indices and cross references as those with which Knoell has supplied us. It may, of course, have been done for all that, as Knoell assures us that it has been done by

the third corrector of *G*, but one hesitates to assume such a hypothesis without strong reason, and the instances in which *PT* &c. do not agree with the Augustine text all tell against it.

A further argument to the same effect would be supplied by those instances—not a few—in which Knoell himself has had to abandon his chosen guides, *MV*. I have noted the following in the passages analysed:

Codd *MV*.

| | |
|----|--|
| p. | 52, 27, corrumpere et |
| | 56, 25, sicut ipse |
| | 58, 8, ei |
| | 59, 20, aphantia, <i>G-MV</i> |
| | 78, 20, peruentionibus grados |
| | 148, 2, quidquid |
| | 149, 8, uocationis, <i>MV</i> |
| | 150, 26, die <i>gen. cf. Cypr. ed. Hartel ind.</i> |
| | 171, 20, initium |
| | 25, uoluntate |
| | 174, 4, quas |
| | 8, consentit |
| | 176, 21, noluisse |

KNOELL.

| |
|------------------------------------|
| corpore |
| sicuti se <i>DGPT</i> |
| sui, <i>DGPT</i> |
| <i>ἀνθρώπου</i> apathia, <i>PT</i> |
| peruentionis gradus |
| quid |
| uocationis |
| diei, <i>PT</i> |
| uitium |
| uoluntatem |
| quae |
| consensit, <i>PT</i> |
| noluisse |

I do not like to speak at all confidently without a more prolonged study than I have been able to give. All that I have done has been to sink a few shafts into the text here and there, and set the results before the reader. If Knoell has not yet published his promised essay, he would perhaps himself take account of the considerations here put forward. It is true that in several places he refers to the text of Augustine, and in some makes use of it to support his own text, but I cannot be sure that he has formed a clear, well-reasoned conception of the relation of the two texts to each other. It seems to me that such a conception was essential to the formation of a trustworthy text.

I will venture to throw out a single suggestion for what it is worth. In the course of the above analysis I have been led to suspect that the most constant element in the preferable readings was *T*, and that combinations of *T* with another MS. had special claims to consideration. Against this it may be urged that *T* has interpolations—that is, it continues the extracts a little further—in caps. xxv., lxxxvi., clxi., and adds a new heading in clvi. In the first two places *T* stands alone; in the greater part of the third it is combined with *GP*, and in the fourth with *GPv*. But I do not wish to lay stress on the singular readings of *T*, which do not appear to have any special value, so much as on *T* in combination with other MSS.: where, as is

frequently the case in some parts, it goes over to *MV*, it seems to me to carry with it the preponderance to the other side. This is only a *prima facie* view, but it might perhaps be worth testing.

In regard to our last point, the reflex influence which this edition of Eugippius may be expected to have on the text of S. Augustine, it is clear that this influence will be considerable, and that for fixing the text of S. Augustine, Knoell's digest of the readings of the MSS. of Eugippius will be of high importance. A few instances strike me at once where we may correct Dombart's text: we must remove the brackets from *absit* in p. 524, l. 16; we must restore *singula* for *singuli*, p. 620, 15, and read *facturas* for *victuras*, p. 621, 4. Whatever may be the true reading in S. Augustine—I have little doubt that in Eugippius, p. 58, 16 we ought to read *actiones*, and I am not at all sure that this is not what S. Augustine himself wrote. Outside the *De Civitate* the Vienna Eugippius is the nearest approach which we possess to a critical edition of S. Augustine.

Fortunately a good *apparatus criticus* is independent of the text which stands above it, and though I have freely expressed my doubts on the subject of Knoell's text, I am none the less grateful to him for the long, and I fear dreary, toil which this edition must have cost him.

W. SANDAY.

PALAEOGRAPHY IN FRANCE.

Album Paléographique ou Recueil de Documents importants relatifs à l'Histoire et à la Littérature nationales . . . avec des notices explicatives par la Société de l'École des Chartes. Paris: Maison Quantin, 1887. 150 francs.

THERE is no study more indebted to photography than the study of palaeography. The facsimiles of MSS. of all ages which have been produced during the last twenty years by the improved methods of permanent photographic printing now form a body of material so extensive in range, and generally so excellent in execution, that a road to a knowledge of the subject lies open to the student in a royal manner which would be the envy of those who struggled with the hand-made facsimiles of other days—those facsimiles often mere grotesque imitations of the originals, and, if of better design, scanty in number and high in price. When one turns over the facsimiles given, for example, in such a work as the *Nouveau Traité de Diplomatique*, one wonders how any one could pretend to derive any accurate ideas from their study. Indeed it may be doubted whether, in those days, any one who had not access to a library of MSS. could possibly learn more than simple rudiments from such works. Now everything in this respect is changed. Facsimiles which can be trusted as the very shadows of the originals are now within reach of all who choose to hold out their hands for them, and palaeography may be studied at ease. And the material will go on accumulating—not only in the production of single pages as specimens of handwriting in particular countries at particular periods, but in the reproduction of entire volumes for purposes of textual criticism.

In the Introduction to the work before us the writer, M. Léopold Delisle, the director of the Bibliothèque Nationale sketches out what has been done in this direction in the several countries of Europe during recent years. It is satisfactory to see that England is not behindhand in such work. He truly remarks that reproduction in facsimile is destined to develop to an extent which we scarcely yet appreciate. We are not content now-a-days to accept the readings of a printed text without question. We wish to know the readings of the best MSS.; and it will in the end be found easier to make the MSS.—in

facsimile—come before the world, than that the world should go to consult the MSS. Hitherto this has been found a somewhat expensive process; such facsimile editions have often been necessarily issued by subscription, and subscriptions have not been always forthcoming in spontaneous readiness. In the infancy of things there is always this struggle; but I would appeal to those happy bodies, corporations which do not die, libraries which never break up, to support such efforts and add to their stores these facsimile-books which must in the future be true books of reference. It may be safely predicted that an increasing stimulus will be given to the application of photography to the reproduction of texts on a scale not hitherto dreamt of. Photography can never hope to compete with the printing-press in cheapness, but it will one day compete with the copyist; and in cases where entire MSS. are of sufficient importance to require their texts to be published with perfect accuracy, copyist and printing-press must inevitably be superseded by the camera. And once let there be sufficient demand, prohibitive prices will vanish. There is no reason why the best classical texts should not thus be reproduced—a scheme which has been proposed more than once. Energy, perseverance, and above all the timely assistance of those corporate bodies whose aid has been invoked, would soon settle the matter. We have indeed made a beginning—the Hellenic Society has published a facsimile edition of the *Laurentian Sophocles*; but it is whispered that there are still copies unsubscribed for which might be standing on the accessible shelves of college libraries.

France is happy in having an École des Chartes, a school in which young men have the opportunity of receiving a practical training in palaeographical subjects, which gives them the power of deciphering ancient records, and fosters a taste for the study of documents connected with the general history of their country and of the minuter details connected with its topography and family history. The *Album Paléographique* is the result of the collaboration of certain members of this school. It consists of fifty plates, with descriptive letter-press, representing MSS. preserved, with two exceptions, in the libraries of France. They cover a long period, ranging from the fifth or sixth century down to the close of the seventeenth

century. At first sight this seems too long. One would object that, for practical purposes, a collection of fifty plates were better restricted within narrower limits. But we are told that this is only a first instalment of what, if carried out, will be an extensive work illustrating the progress of writing, particularly that of France, as developed in successive ages. This reconciles us to finding within the same covers a facsimile of the Paris Prudentius at one end, and the Declaration of the French Clergy in 1682 at the other. And it may be presumed that it is with a view to a final arrangement in one great series, when the issue shall be complete, that the plates in the *Album* are without numbers—certainly a temporary inconvenience.

The first plate, as already noticed, is drawn from the MS. of the poems of Prudentius, written in rustic capital letters at the end of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century. The MS. is of interest as a late specimen in this style of writing; for capitals had by this time been generally superseded by uncial characters as the literary hand in codices. And further, it can be approximately dated, for it contains the name of Vettius Agorius Basilius, who there can be little doubt is the consul of the West of that name, who held office in the year 527. The writing is very regular and free, and, though rather ornamental, has little of the imitative effort which is so evident in that of the Utrecht Psalter. With this plate is given a facsimile of one of the pages of the Latin Christian poem of the year 394, written in uncials of the sixth century and bound up in the same volume as the Prudentius. Next follow seven plates from uncial MSS. ascribed to the sixth century. The Lyons Pentateuch is one of those rarer MSS. which are written in triple columns. The text is ante-Hieronymian. A part of this MS. was sold by Libri to the late Lord Ashburnham; but has been restored to its place by the present Earl. Another MS., which also contributed towards Professor Libri's collection of ancient MSS., is the Psalter (plate 3), also of Lyons, written in uncials on an abnormally large scale, a part of which is now in the library of Ashburnham Place. The *Codex Puteanus*, containing the third decade of Livy (plate 4), apart from its value as one of the earliest MSS. of the author, deserves particular attention on account of the character of the uncial hand in which it is written. It is not of the very exactly finished and rounded type which we see in so many of the extant uncial MSS.,

particularly in certain copies of the Gospels, on the execution of which particular pains appear to have been expended, but it is of a free and at first sight more careless type, which at the same time is evidently the work of a most skilful scribe, writing with perfect ease a hand to which he is thoroughly accustomed. This style of writing is still better exemplified in the Vienna MS. of Livy of about the same period. It may be said to bear to uncial writing of the more exact type somewhat the same relation that the freely written rustic capital does to the more formal square capital. The Paris MS. originally belonged to the Abbey of Corbie, from the wreck of whose famous library the Bibliothèque Nationale has gathered so many valuable relics. Although it is here classed among MSS. of the sixth century, it is satisfactory to see a saving clause in the accompanying letter-press by which it may be moved back into the previous century. On the same plate is given a facsimile of the single uncial fragment of the *Natural History* of Pliny in the Bibliothèque Nationale, written in round uncials and certainly not so ancient.

The next five plates represent works by St. Hilary, Origen, and St. Augustine, all taken from MSS. preserved in the library at Lyons, and most of them written in the fine half-uncial hand of the sixth century, certain dated specimens of which form so prominent a feature in the *Exempla* of Zangemeister and Wattenbach. The important part which this character of writing played in the formation of our own English hand through its earlier adoption by the Irish, renders it an object of special interest to English palaeographers. Its influence also in the school of Tours, which evolved from it the ornamental half-uncial hand which the scribes of that school employed with such effect in certain parts of their handsomely written Bibles, has been recently traced by M. Delisle in one of his many valuable contributions to the study of palaeography. The series of early uncial MSS. is brought to a close with a facsimile from the MS. of canons of councils and papal constitutions, once belonging to Corbie and now in the Bibliothèque Nationale.

The interest of the next following plates is historical. Facsimiles of three ancient MSS. of the *Historia Francorum* of Gregory of Tours, viz. those of Beauvais, Corbie, and Cambrai, all ascribed to the seventh century, give us specimens of the later uncial and of cursive, and a curious example of the half-uncial in an ornamental style; and these are

followed by a plate from the earliest extant MS. of the chronicle of Fredegar.

The progress of French writing from the intricate convolutions of the cursive hands to the simple and elegant Caroline minuscule may be followed in the series of facsimiles which illustrate the eighth and ninth centuries. We can only particularly refer to the plate of the Bible of Theodulf of Orleans, of the ninth century, and those of the MSS. of Charles le Chauve and the Emperor Lothair, as giving fine examples of handwriting; and with regard to the later facsimiles in the volume, their interest is so varied that we must be content to single out those which put themselves more prominently forward.

Plate 23 gives us a specimen of the Greek and Latin Glossary of Laon, of the ninth century, one of those curious MSS. in which we see a western scribe struggling with a language and an alphabet almost forgotten. Among the specimens of the twelfth century is a section from the mortuary roll of Vitalis, founder and abbot of Savigny, who died in 1122. The roll, as was the custom, passed from monastery to monastery, asking for the prayers of the brethren and receiving at each house a few lines of formal commendation and the 'orate pro nostris.' The palaeographical interest of such mortuary rolls, some of which extend to many feet in length, lies in the fact that in a brief compass we have specimens of writing of so many different hands of one and the same period, and these not always from the pens of practised scribes, but also in the unpretending style of simple scholars. Another curiosity of the next century is the sketch-book of the architect Villard de Hannecourt, to whom the construction of the cathedral of Cambrai is said to have been entrusted.

Two celebrated historical MSS. are also represented: the autograph MS. of the

Historia Ecclesiastica of Ordericus Vitalis of 1141, and the curiously written copy of the Chronicle of Guillaume de Nangis of the end of the thirteenth century. Three of the plates are connected with Saint Louis. We have a facsimile of his will, dated 'in navi nostra juxta Sardiniam,' when setting out on his second crusade in July, 1270; a page from a beautiful illuminated Psalter, which was executed for him; and a specimen of the earliest MS. of that most simple and charming of chroniclers, the Sire de Joinville. In a MS. of the *Information des Princes* by Jean Goulain, there is presented to us a portrait of Charles the Fifth of France, that great collector of fine MSS., several of which contribute to illustrate the series before us. And lastly we may notice two parallel pages from MSS. of the *Miracles de Notre Dame* written by Jean Miélot for Philip the Good of Burgundy, and finely illustrated by artists of the Burgundian school. One of these MSS. is in the Bodleian Library.

In noticing the later MSS. in this *Album* we may perhaps have tried the patience of those readers of the *Classical Review* whose interest may be principally limited to the more classical MSS. of the uncial period. We hope that in future issues of this work the members of the École des Chartes will not forget this interest, and that they will continue to provide in sufficient numbers facsimiles of the Latin classical MSS. preserved in French libraries. Greek MSS. are almost entirely excluded from the present volume. If this exclusion is to be continued in future issues—and the wording of the title page seems rather to imply it—perhaps it may be found possible to devote a special album to the production of a Greek series of facsimiles from the abundant material which exists at Paris, if not in other parts of France.

E. MAUNDE THOMPSON.

ENGELHARDT ON LATIN CONJUGATION.

Die Lateinische Konjugation nach der Ergebnissen der Sprachvergleichung dargestellt, von MAX ENGELHARDT. Berlin: Weidmann. 1887. Pp. viii. 140. 2 Mk. 40.

THIS little treatise is written by one of the strictest sect of the 'young grammarians.' Its purpose is to show the simplicity and the regularity of the Latin verbal system

when viewed in the light of the two great principles of phonetic law and association of form. Not only does it maintain that the structure of the verb becomes more transparent, when so regarded, but also that much light is thrown upon the syntax as well. Some of the illustrations of the latter are enough to take away the breath of a scholar who has not

followed the more recent developements of comparative philology. That the double use of the perfect is due to the fact that it was formed by one or the other of two methods, the former belonging to the perfect tense, the latter properly to the aorist—this is a proposition which might not startle him. That the personal terminations should be due to a blending of the old perfect with the weak aorist would seem a little more surprising. That the future perfect was a modified form of the conjunctive of the sigmatic aorist would appear almost inconceivable. But bewilderment would reach its height, when it was gravely stated that the conjunctive imperfect was only a form of the aorist indicative in Latin. And yet no one of these statements is strictly novel; there is much to be said for every one of them; and it is certain both that they are phonetically possible, and that some rules of syntax become by their admission much more easy to understand. The treatise of Dr. Engelhardt, like the still more compressed statement of similar views by Dr. Stolz, in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, is a work of exposition, not of discussion; and hence it often appears to fall into the besetting sin of philologists, and to say 'is' or 'must be,' where a sober reader is inclined to substitute 'seems to be' or 'may be.' The fact is that we are at a stage where a wise discretion will use a negative form of utterance more frequently than a positive. If we meet with the assertion that 'the best derivation of *provincia* is from *providentia*,' we may modestly but firmly deny this, seeing that it is in direct violation of three well-established laws, the action of any one of which is fatal to it. But if we are asked what the true derivation is, it may be incumbent on us to use some hesitating form of speech. Mr. Roby, fifteen years ago, refused to worship at the fashionable shrine of Corssen, and to construct the vowel-system of Latin according to the rules of Sanskrit grammarians; and the result is that not a page of his grammar is antiquated to-day, while works of the same date that seemed to be leading the van can now be used only as warnings, or at best as landmarks of the advance of science.

It is impossible within narrow limits even to state, still less to discuss, the points on which the new philology leads to results different from those given in the current grammars. A few must be selected for comment. Forms like *momordi* are represented as coming from an original

merdo, and as giving rise in their turn to the later present *mordeo*: while conversely it is asserted that the perfect of *verto* must have been originally *revorti*. This ingenious view of De Saussure's brings in a parallelism with forms like γέγωνα or ἔμμοπα, but this is hardly adequate evidence for the conjecture to be put forward as a fact. As a matter of fact, there seems to be quite as much evidence for regarding *vortit* as a present form and *vertit* as the perfect, a doctrine which Professor Key used to lay down with some confidence. For instance, in Plaut. *Amphitr. Prolog.*, 95, the MSS. have *animum advortite*, but in l. 121 they have the perfect *vertit*, though Goetz and Loewe change this into *vortit*. Similarly in *Trucul.* 221, the MSS. (including A) have *verterunt*, again changed by Schoell into *vorterunt*. The case is precisely the same in *Trin. Prolog.*, 19. In fact, although the form *vort-* is commonly enough given by the MSS. of Plautus in the imperfect tenses, I have noted no instance as yet in which it is given in a perfect form. If this observation is correct, it seems a little bold to assume that our earliest authorities have not only not preserved but have actually inverted the archaic forms.

The startling thesis, due to Stolz, *Verbal-flexion*, that *stare* = ἰστημι, is based upon the form *astasent* given by Festus (p. 26, M.) and there explained by *statuerunt*, the long *e* being derived from the analogy of **audiem*, *audies*, &c., which retain the characteristic of the optative. Phonetically there is nothing against the view, and it finds strong confirmation in the hypothetical use of the tense. It is a curious commentary on the prevalent notion of the force of 'doubt' attaching to the subjunctive mood alone that, as Mr. Roby well points out, Cicero, after using *si* with the indicative, has to alter the form of the expression to show that there is no doubt.

The forms *stas*, *stat*, &c., are explained to be aorist forms, which have lost the augment, and which afterwards created by analogy the first person *sto* in imitation of *-ao* verbs. The future *ero* is asserted to be a conjunctive present (= Gr. ὦ for ἔστω), the vowel after the *r* being the conjunctive vowel which appears as *ε* and *ο* in the non-thematic Greek conjunctive (e.g. ἐπιστάμεν: cf. ἵσμεν by the side of ἵμεν), where there is no vowel appended to the stem, except that required to indicate the mood. With regard to the inflexions of the perfect, Dr. Engelhardt follows the most recent views, which find in the well-known *dede* of the

Pisaurian inscriptions not a mutilated form, but an instance of the true perfect termination, to which *d* is added by 'contamination' with the aorist, (i.e. a borrowing of aoristic forms for an allied tense), ultimately becoming *t*. Osthoff's view of the *i* of the first person in the perfect as a termination originally proper to the middle voice is also accepted without question. Similarly, his theory that the *-sti* of the perfect is due to a blending of the *s* of the aorist, and the *-ti* of the perfect, as in forms like *dicti*, from which *dicisti* came only at a later date, is given without hesitation.

Dr. Engelhardt's work does not, so far as I am aware, make any claim to originality; but it gives in a clear and complete form

the latest results of philological speculation into the origin of Latin verbal flexion. The most serious drawback that I have noticed is that references to Neue's *Formenlehre* are made to the first and much less complete edition. Whether English schoolmasters will think it advisable to introduce these speculations even to their more advanced pupils is a question which it would not be easy to answer with as much confidence as Dr. Engelhardt seems to feel in the case of his German colleagues. But many an English teacher ought to find the book interesting and stimulating, even if it is not practically useful.

A. S. WILKINS.

THE NEW EDITION OF BOECKH'S *PUBLIC ECONOMY OF ATHENS*.

Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener, von AUGUST BOECKH. Dritte Auflage herausgegeben und mit Anmerkungen begleitet von Max Fränkel. 2 vols. Berlin. G. Reimer. 1886. 30 Mk.

IN one of his notes (No. 746) to the volumes before us, Fränkel has called attention to the great value of Boeckh's treatment of the question he is discussing even where it was based on error and accordingly has led to an erroneous conclusion. Boeckh had supposed that the Public Treasure at Athens had consisted of a number of separate parts, viz., that of Athena Polias, that of Athena Nikê, &c., and was accordingly driven to display the greatest ingenuity in explaining how such a vast sum as 7,000 talents, which had been 'brought into the acropolis' (Andoc. *De Pace*, 8; Æschin, *De Fals. Leg.* 175) between 422 and 416 B.C., may have been expended, especially as the actual treasury accounts of those and the succeeding years are so small. Boeckh, however, honestly confesses that he is not satisfied with his own ingenuity and feels that there is something wrong. Since then Kirchhoff (*Zur Geschichte des Ath. Staatsschatzes im 5ten Jahrhundert*, in the *Abhandl. der Berliner Akad.* 1876) has shown that these were special temple treasures quite distinct from the Public Treasure, which was also kept in the Temple of Athena. The Hellenotamiae administered what belonged to the state, the treasurers of Athena what belonged to Athena. An analogy

from later times is given (Note 268) from a Delphic inscription, which shows that the Public Treasure was kept along with the Sacred Treasure in the Temple of Apollo; the latter being administered by *ιεροποιοί*, the former by *ραμίαι*. This may be taken as a signal example of the value of Boeckh's method. The editor of the *Corpus of Greek Inscriptions* had wide learning, but that learning never overwhelmed him. Like Grote, he had that vivid intuition of reality and that transparent simplicity of expression which belong to true genius; like Grote also, he is never in a hurry, but always proceeds cautiously and reviews the whole position according as each point is gained; and above all he is never actuated by any other desire than to attain to the truth, and accordingly, when he does fall into error, always shows quite plainly how his mistake has arisen.

The excellent scholar who has brought out this new edition of Boeckh's great work has shown sound judgment in the course he has adopted. He has not altered a single word of Boeckh's own writing, but has reproduced the second edition, mistakes and all, as the text; under the text are the references, all looked up and compared with the best modern editions, together with additional notes from Boeckh's private papers and books. The editor's supplementary notes to the first volume are printed at the end of the second volume. In the second volume, to which Boeckh had appended no notes, the supplementary notes are added at

the foot of the page. Fränkel's notes all through are most learned and pertinent. He has studied the many books and magazine articles bearing on the several questions with that methodical completeness and patience which characterise German scholars; and he has not forgotten to give our scholars who have worked in the same field, Newton and Hicks, their just meed of recognition. There is an excellent index; the printing is clear and accurate; and the work is enriched with an etching of Boeckh when he was a young man in about 1817, which it is interesting to compare with the portrait of the veteran scholar in his maturer years given by the American translator.

While recognizing as clearly as possible the great merits of Boeckh, Fränkel is far from being a blind disciple. Thus, where Boeckh takes τὰς εἰσφορὰς τὰς ἀπὸ Ναυσινίκου (Dem. *Androt.* 44) as the income-tax of the year of Nausinicus, Fränkel after a review of the many interpretations of the passage, (Note 82) concurs in the opinion that the expression must mean the income-taxes of the twenty-four years between the archonship of Nausinicus and the date of the speech. This is Grote's view (viii. 110, note 3); but then the number τριακόσια is too small. Boeckh (quoted in Note 821) considers rightly that, as Demosthenes paid eighteen minae as income-tax in ten years on a rateable property of three talents, the amount of income-tax derived from the whole rateable property of the country, which was 6000 talents (*De Symmor.* § 19), must have been 600 talents in the same period. Fränkel accordingly thinks that there is a corruption in the word τριακόσια. Mr. Pearson on pp. 77, 78, of this Review has reverted to Boeckh's opinion, urging that there is reference to a property tax of 5 per cent. which Androtion was employed to collect in *Androt.* 617, § 77. But δεκατείνοντες there is used quite generally for any excessive taxation and the double income-tax of the second clause does not necessarily refer to δεκατείνοντες. And it is hard to assent to the unusual interpretation Mr. Pearson gives of εἰσφορὰς τὰς ἀπὸ Ναυσινίκου and of the plural εἰσφορὰς without examples of such usages being adduced.

It will be possible to mention only a few of the points in which Fränkel has collected material tending to correct and supplement Boeckh. Notable among the scholars who have furthered knowledge in this department are Kirchhoff and Köhler, the editors of the *Corpus of Attic Inscriptions*. Kirch-

hoff has, as we have seen, set Boeckh right as to the Public Treasure. Again, on another point, viz. the obligation of the cleruchi to tribute, Kirchhoff (*Abhandl. der Berliner Akad.* 1873) has shown against Boeckh that they were not subject to any tribute. What appears to be such was really paid by the states in whose territories cleruchi were settled; for there were numbers of cases in which cleruchi were settled *beside* the original inhabitants, the latter not having been completely expelled. As regards the much-discussed ὀρχήστρα in Plat. *Apol.* 26 D¹, Boeckh says that it means the Dionysiac theatre and that books were sold there during the time no performances were being held. Schöne maintains that ὀρχήστρα was the name of a place in Athens where was the book market (τὰ βιβλία) which is referred to by Eupolis and Pollux; it was north of the slope between the Acropolis and the Areopagus (Timaeus *lex. s.v. ὀρχήστρα*, compared with Arrian, *Anab.* iii. 16, 8, quoted in Baumeister, *Denkmäler* i. 164, 165). But Fränkel (Note 89) points out that as papyrus about this time cost nearly three drachmas for two pieces (*C. I. A.* i. 324, col. c, l. 33), it is very improbable that books could be sold at such a low price as a drachma, so that we must acquiesce in the view that ὀρχήστρα means the stage and that the reference is to Euripides as the exponent of the doctrines of Anaxagoras. Fränkel presses his point by urging that thus εἰ πάνυ πολλοῦ gets a strong force, for the fee for the *whole* three days' performance at the Dionysia at two obols a day would be a drachma; and again that Euripides as the disciple of Anaxagoras did call the sun χρυσίαν βῶλον in the *Phaethon* (Diog. L. ii. 10). He might have added *Orestes*, 982 ff. and the Scholiast. But did the Athenian stage never act anything except Euripides at the time of the trial of Socrates? And would Socrates approve of people taking their philosophical opinions second-hand, and second-hand from the rhetorical stage (cf. *Gorg.* 502 B)? Further too it is more probable that the χάριαι alluded to in the inscription were sheets of some special kind adapted for book-keeping; for we find in the second century that similar sheets for book-keeping cost five drachmas (*Bull. de corr. hell.* vi. 23), yet we know that ordinary χαρτία to write notes on in the third century cost only a trifle. It is related of Cleanthes that he was so very poor that he had not even the κέρματα necessary to buy χαρτία, and had to

¹ On this compare Adam *in loc.* who argues against Fränkel.

commit the notes of Zeno's lectures to potsherds and the shoulder-blades of oxen (Diog. L. vii. 174). The name Euripides reminds us of the financial proposal of another Euripides alluded to in Aristoph. *Eccl.* 818 ff. which Boeckh has strangely considered to be a direct property-tax, a view which Fränkel (Note 803) criticises with considerable vigour and shows after Grote (vii. 544) that Boeckh is somewhat heedless in this discussion. We can feel sure of nothing about the proposal except that the 500 talents were 'comic exaggeration.' Another point in which Boeckh is criticised is his view that the plaintiff had not to pay the *ἐπωβελία* if he got one-fifth of the votes. This is disproved by Libanius ap. R. Förster in *Hermes* ix. p. 53, καὶ οἱ παρ' ἡμῶν νόμοι μετὰ τὰς ἀφάσεις τῶν ἡγωνισμένων οὐκ αὐτοῖς τιμὴν ἐμμετροῦσι ἀλλ' ἐπιτίμια τοῖς οὐχ ἐλοῦσι ἐπωβελίαν καὶ προτανεῖα κὰν μηδὲ λάβῃ τὸ πέμπτον μέρος τῶν ψήφων ἡτῶνται, by the silence of most grammarians, and by such passages as Dem. *Arphob.* i. § 67, Isocr. *adv. Call.* § 3. Apparent exceptions such as Isocr. *l. c.* § 12. Poll. viii. 48, are to be referred to special kinds of process, in the former case to *διαμαρτυρία*, in the latter to *φάσις*, if indeed the latter is not, as Förster thinks (p. 71), a confusion made by Pollux between the *ἐπωβελία* and the 1,000 drachmas, which had to be paid in all *γραφαὶ* except *εἰσαγγελία*, in case the prosecutor did not get one-fifth of the votes (cf. Dem. *Theocr.* § 6). Fränkel holds that the plaintiff if defeated in any case paid the *ἐπωβελία*, the defendant had to pay it only in case he made a counter-plea or exception, and even then he remained free if he got one-fifth of the votes. It is to be noticed that Fränkel is not afraid to confess that he was in error (in his *Geschwornengerichte*) in assenting to Philochorus (in Schol. on Aristoph. *Vesp.* 718) and Boeckh, that in 446 there were only 19,000 nominal Attic citizens, of whom 4,760 were disqualified. In 432 there were at all events 27,000 (Thuc. ii. 13), which is too large an increase for fourteen years. Rather the 19,000 of Philochorus were only those citizens who gave in their names for the distribution of corn. But all trivial and unintelligent criticism of his master (such as Beloch's contention that the meaning of *τίμημα* is 'property' not 'rateable property')

Fränkel brushes aside with that vigorous and trenchant stroke of which he has given us a good example in his contention with Thalheim in the matter of the *Antidosis*.

Supplementary matter occupies the most extensive portion of Fränkel's notes. Thus reference is made to *C. I. A.* ii. 8346 (in the Addenda) to show more fully the prices of building materials; to the list of proscribed goods sold by the *πωληταί* (*C. I. A.* i. 274, l. 15) to show that houses cost as little as 105 drachmas; while again we find in the lease of a house and land by the phratría of the Dyaleis to Diodorus (*C. I. A.* ii. 600) that rent, though usually about 8 p.c., was in this case 12 p.c. of the value, and that the lessee was to put the house in order and fulfil other duties so as to keep the land in proper condition. Further reference is made to the lists of the *πωληταί* (i. 277, l. 16) for additional information on the price of slaves, and to the Delphic inscriptions published by Wescher and Foucart on the prices paid for their manumission, with some valuable remarks (Note 120) on the standard of money (which was not the Attic) referred to in these documents. That there was sometimes a public administration of charitable donations for education is shown (Note 211) by important inscriptions of Teos and Delphi (see *Bull. de corresp. hell.* iv. 111, v. 157), especially the former (cf. *Hermes* ix. 501-503) where there is much detail as to the annual salaries of the teachers who were elected yearly; the music-master was most highly paid, 700 drachmas. It is noticeable that girls had a share in the education (l. 9). Often too, Fränkel gives good summaries of the results of recent discussion, e.g. in regard to the charges against Phidias (Note 350), and concerning the Athenian *γραμματεῖς* (Note 340), though in this latter place he has not mentioned the dissertation of Kornitzer.

At the end of his preface, Fränkel has expressed a hope that this new edition, which has gone forth a century after Boeckh's birth, may continue to advance our knowledge and to increase the fame of its author. In joining in this hope may we be allowed to say that its realization will be in no small degree due to the learning, patience, and judgment of the able editor.

SHORTER NOTICES.

Poetae Lyrici Graeci Minores. Edidit JON. POMTOW.
2 voll. Leipzig. Hirzel, 1885. (Price 5 Mk.)

THE want of a handy edition of the text of the Greek lyric poets has long been felt, and these small volumes supply it very satisfactorily. There is no preface, and it is not stated what text is followed; but where I have made any detailed comparison, it seems to keep pretty close to that of Bergk. Each volume has an excellent double index.

When we ask what should be included in a volume of this title, we are at once met by the difficulty that there is no satisfactory definition of lyrical poetry. The term did not come into use till a late period, and even then was used vaguely. The modern theory which defines a lyric as a poem expressing some single emotion, and so distinct on the one side from narrative and on the other from reflective poetry, is quite foreign to ancient criticism, and cannot well be applied to ancient poetry. What the name practically means to us in Greek literature is (1) the song, including the lyrical portions of tragedy and comedy, and such forms as the *scotlon*, the *hymnæus*, or the *eiresionê*; and (2) poems written in certain defined metres which as a matter of fact are suitable (*ἄπὸ πέρας ἤρμοικεν*) to the expression of emotional poetry.

So long as we confine ourselves to these melic poems, the task of selection is pretty plain; though the definition, wide as it is, would not cover the two noble hexameters of Eumelus with which this collection most fitly opens, nor the famous *Ἀλακῶτα* of Erinna. But when we admit poems written in the elegiac and iambic metres as lyrical, difficulties appear at once. There is no difference of kind between these iambic pieces and many fragments of speeches from lost dramas; yet it is precisely the speeches in dramas that we call distinctively the non-lyrical portions. Again, it would seem strange to exclude Theognis from the lyric list. But no one calls Propertius a lyric poet. And if we admit Theognis, how are we to exclude the epigrammatists? Herr Pomtow has here thrown theory overboard altogether, and admits any fragment of poetry otherwise unclassified of a date anterior to 300 B.C. Sometimes the results are curious. When Bergk prints the epigrams attributed to Sappho or Simonides, it is sufficient justification that these were essentially lyrical poets, and that it is therefore proper to include everything they wrote, or were supposed to have written. But when Herr Pomtow prints sepulchral and votive inscriptions from *Kaibel* or the *Corpus Inscriptionum*, the case is different. For instance

Συμῶν μ' ἀνέθηκε Ποσειδάωνι Φάνακτι,
vol. i. p. 334,

or Θουκυδίδης' Ὀλόρου' Ἀλιμοῦσιος,
vol. ii. p. 144,

cannot by any reach of imagination be called lyrical poems, if indeed they can be called poems at all.

It is perhaps more interesting to observe what he has done in selection and rejection of the fragments of the better-known poets. This task must always be a delicate one, and individual judgments will vary much as to the limit of length or of intelligibility which makes a fragment worth printing in what does not profess to be a complete collection. The present editor has on the whole shown sound judgment in his choice. To take, as a crucial instance, the fragments of Sappho: out of the 117 fragments (excluding the epigrams and what follows them) in Bergk, Herr Pomtow prints sixty-six. It may be safely said that no one of these sixty-six would be better away; and most of the remaining fifty-one have no distinct

literary value. On the other hand there are at least five of these last (18, 30, 37, 38, 88 in Bergk) which are as characteristic and as beautiful as anything in Sappho: it is not obvious why

πολλά μοι τὰν
Πωλυανὰκτιδα παῖδα χαίρων
should be admitted to the exclusion of
ὡς δὲ παῖς πέδα μάτ' ἐρα πεπτερόγυμαι
and
τί με Πανδίωνις ὤ' ῥαννα χελιδών;

And it may be fairly urged that the least relic of the really great poets is more worth preserving than any amount of verse of the *Θουκυδίδης' Ὀλόρου' Ἀλιμοῦσιος* order: though against that there is a superficial argument for representative selection of good and bad.

The poems, melic, iambic, elegiac, and miscellaneous, are very sensibly arranged all together in chronological order of authorship, century by century, with the *ἀδίσποστα* inserted as near their chronological place as possible. The book is printed in a small pocket size, on good paper, and with what has been good type. It happens annoyingly often that a letter is missing and the outside edge of a line. A collection on a similar method (but omitting the epigrams) with a translation and no notes, would do much to familiarise English readers with these poor relics of poets whose loss, with the doubtful exception of Menander, is perhaps the greatest that time has inflicted on European literature.

J. W. MACRAIL.

The Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle: Books I-IV
(omitting 1-6) and X. 6-9. Translated by ST.
GEORGE STOCK. Oxford: Blackwell. London:
Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.

THIS is a translation of those parts of the *Ethics* which are taken in for examination by the Oxford passman. To each book is prefixed a brief summary of its contents, and at the end of the whole is placed a series of very minute questions, covering not only every chapter but every section, and designed to bring out every point in Aristotle's argument, sometimes even to suggest reflexion upon it. This 'catechetical analysis' is intended especially to help those who are trying to get up their work by themselves, and it seems very well calculated to do so. Of the translation, which Mr. Stock acknowledges to be meant for 'the less ambitious student,' I should say that it is literal enough for the least ambitious and that, so far as I have tested it, it seems accurate.

H. RICHARDS.

Plutarchi Sullæ: with introduction and notes by the
Rev. H. A. HOLDEN, LL.D. Cambridge, Uni-
versity Press. 6s.

DR. HOLDEN's editions of Plutarch's lives of Themistocles and the Gracchi have established his reputation as a scholar in the Greek of the later prose writers. In this respect he is seen to full advantage in the present volume. Though the immense learning of Wyttienbach, and the labours of Sintenis and others have greatly lightened the task of editing Plutarch for ordinary readers, Dr. Holden deserves the thanks of all lovers of his author for the completeness of his work, which includes copious verbal and grammatical indices, a brief appendix on the text (to the correction of which the editor has made a single happy contribution, in ch. 28-1), and abundant notes, with parallel passages quoted in full, on all words and constructions the least likely to cause difficulty or arrest the reader's attention.

Considering that the real value of his commentary lies in the linguistic and grammatical portions of it,

it seems a pity that Dr. Holden should not have taken in hand the life of Marius at the same time, or even that of Sertorius as well, and have concentrated his energy and scholarship on the text. As it is, he has buried Plutarch under a vast heap of compilation, much of which consists merely of excerpts from Mommsen and Long, and lengthy quotations or analyses of Appian and other authorities. To fill up Plutarch's gaps is surely not the function of the commentator: nor is it advisable in the interest of education to save the student the trouble of going to the most obvious sources of information. We may take the notes on ch. 27 as an example of this fault. They start with an analysis nearly as long as the chapter itself; to this succeeds another long analysis of two chapters of Appian, also as long as the Greek; and after elaborate notes on various places and individuals, e.g. Dyrrachium, Tifata, Norbanus, &c., we find to our astonishment no less than three pages and a half extracted from Prof. Middleton's *Rome* (a book surely by this time in every library), compressed by a wonderful feat of printing into less than one page of very small print. In the case of this last-mentioned loan Dr. Holden has inadvertently omitted to state that his note is a word-for-word quotation, though at the end of it he has told the reader to refer to Prof. Middleton for additional information on one point. He has taken over from the original at least one misquotation (Liv. 4. 51, for Liv. 7. 3?), and the single addition which he has made (a citation of this life of Sulla 37.3), is likely to puzzle the student, for he is really referring, not to the text of Plutarch, which adds nothing to our knowledge of Sulla's views about the Capitoline temple, but to his own note upon it, which contains the necessary passage from Valerius Maximus. The same tendency to voluminous compilation is also seen in the Introduction, which amongst seventy-three pages of other matter contains the whole of the famous speech of Lepidus in the fragments of Sallust, with an elaborate commentary, based chiefly on Kritiz. We almost wonder that Dr. Holden did not revise the text of the fragments of *Licinianus*, and print them as an appendix; for this author, as we read on p. 130, is 'the nearest writer in time to the period of Sulla,' though on p. lxx. of the Introduction, we are told that he probably belongs to the second century of the imperial epoch.

These examples will serve to show that the volume might have been reduced to half its size, without detracting from its value. What is really wanted in England, in the interest both of learning and education, is a good edition of *all the Lives*; i.e. a revised text, with such apparatus for studying the Greek as may be advisable in the way of indices and notes. No one is better qualified to undertake such a work than Dr. Holden. Is it too much to hope that he may take such an enterprise in hand, and thus confer a real benefit on scholars, and indeed on all readers of these cherished biographies, instead of bestowing infinite pains and labour upon work great part of which is unnecessary, and could be done equally well by very inferior scholars.

W. W. FOWLER.

P. Vergili Maronis Georgicon Libri III. IV. Edited with English Notes by A. SIDGWICK, M.A. (Cambridge University Press). 1886. 2s.

This is professedly a school edition, 'prepared for the use of those students who are not far advanced in Latin,' but it is one from which others than beginners may learn a good deal. It consists of an Introduction, Text, Notes, and three short Indices, (1) Grammatical and General, (2) Style, (3) Names.

As regards the text, the following readings deserve

mention:—*incohat* in III. 42, *exportans* in III. 402, *alvaria* in IV. 34, all surely right. In IV. 291-3, Mr. Sidgwick adopts the order of Rom., instead of following Med. with Conington. In III. 449, it is scarcely accurate to say 'there is good MSS. authority' for *vivaque sulfura*: the authority, according to Conington, is one of Ribbeck's cursives together with the testimony of Servius, Marius, Victorinus, and Macrobius, which latter is justly allowed to outweigh MSS. evidence.

The notes are almost too good for the average schoolboy: but will bear abundant fruit in the hands of a boy of naturally scholarly tastes. Mr. Sidgwick always knows his mind, and lets his reader know it; generally, too, in as few words as possible. Often by a happy phrase in translation, he shows us just how much the poet really meant: this is especially valuable where an image is suggested in a word or two, without being worked out into definiteness even in the poet's own mind. An instance occurs in III. 9, where a comparison of Conington's note with Mr. Sidgwick's will show how many words darken counsel: 'float upon the lips of men' will strike all readers as the one obviously right interpretation. In l. 24, *versis discedat frontibus* seems most simply taken, not, with Servius, of two kinds of scenes, but as describing the movements of rotatory prisms meeting in the centre of the back of the stage. In ll. 26-33, Mr. Sidgwick is no doubt right in holding that the lines were written in B.C. 31, and in taking *puleum* as meaning simply 'defeated.' The note of l. 59 is a useful guide against a Coningtonian pitfall. On l. 307, we would point out that neither of the Greek instances cited are strictly parallel, because in both the accusative appears in the active construction also. Really it is a use of 'internal' accusative surviving as a legitimate variation with the passive verb where it has been superseded by another case with the active. The note on III. 385 receives correction in that on IV. 222, where the rule is given that *-que* is lengthened 'only before liquids and double consonants'. That on IV. 50 shows how careful translation may make an inaccuracy fade into a merely poetical presentation. In IV. 74, Mr. Sidgwick is obviously right in taking the line to mean 'whet their stings on their beaks,' and on l. 165, in taking *sorti* as old ablative. On l. 227, he quotes from Mr. Rhoades a piece of translation liable to be misunderstood: if allowed to do so, the British boy will translate '*sideris in numerum*' 'into the number of the stars,' and we do not think Mr. Rhoades's rendering will prove a sufficient barrier. On l. 317, Mr. Sidgwick exposes the double hypothesis whereon rests the usual account of the source from which Vergil took the story of Aristaeus. In l. 447, Mr. Sidgwick takes the simplest view, making *quicquam* the subject to *fallere*: it seems more probable that the line means 'nor is it possible to deceive thee in aught.' In l. 455, he adopts Servius's view, which is almost certainly the correct one, and he writes an admirable note on l. 457, showing it to be a condensation for 'while she was flying in hope to escape.' Another admirable note is on l. 484, though Mr. Sidgwick does not notice that this usage seems only possible by some sort of semi-personification of a natural power.

The Indices are very good, especially that on Style, which might be made most helpful in teaching composition.

"Τότερον πρότερον 'Ομηρικῶς we come to the Introduction, which, as is often the case with Introductions, should be read after the book. As a whole it is most helpful, though, as we have hinted, somewhat beyond the average boy. It is doubtful too whether

so careful an analysis of the imitations and adaptations of Vergil is not almost pernicious to such a reader. Admiration in a boy is the inevitable first step towards appreciation, and we fear this might be checked if he had reason to suppose that the poet was habitually guilty of 'adaptation.' Something of the same sort may be said about other parts of this Introduction: section 8 is wonderfully good, but it is scarcely in place in an elementary edition. Mr. Sidgwick should devote himself to an Introduction to Vergil on a more ambitious scale: giving himself space to quote parallel passages in full: repeating and amplifying what he has said about Vergilian art in various ways; exhibiting to us Vergil as an artist: allowing himself, by quotations from modern poets, and by full use of his felicity of translation, to show that hendriads and the rest are not conundrums to vex the ignorant, but real aids to poetical expression.

F. C.

Tacitus, par ÉMILE PERSON. Paris: Eugene Belin. (Annals 1883. Histories 1880).

THESE two volumes are evidently intended either for the higher classes of schools or for such general students as desire complete editions of moderate size and at moderate cost.

Such publications can only be made remunerative by a very large sale; and it is good evidence of the general interest taken by educated Frenchmen in great classical authors that editors or publishers should feel any such prospect of success as is implied in undertaking a work of this description, instead of restricting themselves, as is usual in England, to an edition comprising one or two books only.

The volumes are a marvel of cheapness. For 3 f. 50 c., the French student can procure a well-printed book of 786 foolscap octavo pages, containing the whole of the Annals, with a concise, but by no means meagre commentary and introduction, the speech of Claudius, and an index of proper names. The other volume gives, for 2 f., in 460 pages, the whole of the Histories on a similar scale, with the additional gain of a summary of the contents of the text.

Taken as a whole, this must be pronounced to be, as far as I am aware, much the most useful general edition of this author to be found in any language, at anything like so low a cost. Nor is it to be supposed that its cheapness is its only recommendation. Viewed apart from such considerations, the commentary is eminently clear and practical, ignoring none of the chief difficulties of interpretation in the text, and giving as much assistance in illustration of the subject-matter as any readers to whom Tacitus was part of a general course of study rather than a special subject would be likely to desire.

On comparison with more elaborate editions or with school editions containing only a small portion of the author, it will be found that the chief curtailment consists in dwelling less fully on grammatical questions, and in giving the general substance of, rather than full references to or citations from, ancient authors and modern works.

The edition of the Annals seems rather superior to that of the Histories, partly, perhaps, as being the later work and hence the result of a more complete study of the author, partly as having had the full advantage of the labours of Nipperdey, Draeger, and E. Jacob; whereas the edition of the Histories appeared too soon to be able to profit by any portion of that of Meiser.

It appears from the advertisement that the same firm has published the Germania at 75 c., the Agricola at 30 c., the former by the same editor, the latter by M. H. Henry.—H. FURNEAUX.

The Histories of Tacitus, Books I. and II., by A. D. GODLEY, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen Coll. Oxford (Macmillan & Co.) 5s.

THIS is a useful little edition, deriving its chief value from the closeness with which the notes of Dr. Carl Heraeus have been followed. This indebtedness is acknowledged in the preface, and those who do not read German ought to be grateful to Mr. Godley for bringing 'this excellent commentary' within their reach. In one passage, however, the editor has followed his guide not wisely but too well. On II. 16, 4, he remarks that Sardinia and Corsica, though handed over by Nero to the senate, were governed by a procurator as being a small province. As a senatorial province it could of course only be governed by a proconsul. The mistake is evidently caused by Heraeus' note on II. 12, 13, where he says that the Maritime Alps 'als eine kleine senats-provinz,' was ruled by a procurator. Is 'senats-provinz' a slip on the part of Heraeus or a misprint? Mr. Godley is not strictly correct in saying on I. 2, 5, that the siege of Jerusalem was contemporary with the war between the Flavians and Vitellius. Again on I. 39, 7, the Rostra Julia are stated to be near the temple of Saturn, and erected by J. Caesar. Prof. Middleton p. 157, referred to in proof of this, shows that they were built by Augustus, being in fact the podium of the Heroon of Julius. The note on *evocatum* I. 41, 16, is incorrect, as the special meaning of the word under the empire is left unnoticed. One or two other little inaccuracies need correcting in a 2nd edition, e.g. the statements on I. 50, 14, that Perugia was the scene of a battle, or on I. 52, 16, that Caecina commanded in Upper, Valens in Lower Germany. A comparison of *non arma noscere* (I. 63, 5), with *non principia noscere* (II. 93) seems to suggest a better translation than 'they were ignorant of the use of arms'; and the note on *adjuncto Brit. exercitu* I. 61, ignores the fact that only vexilla of the British legions joined Vitellius. The different readings are usually given with care, and emendations judiciously selected, but it is aggravating to find so many vague references to Juvenal, Horace, Pliny, &c.—E. G. H.

Thirteen Satires of Juvenal. Edited by C. H. PEARSON, M.A., and H. A. STRONG, M.A., LL.D. Clarendon Press, Oxford: 1887. 6s. 6d.

WE have here in two handy volumes the text of the satires contained in Professor Mayor's edition together with sixty pages of introduction and a whole volume of commentary. It is to be regretted that the editors have entirely excluded the sixth satire, which has been declared by a most competent judge to be Juvenal's masterpiece and which, unlike the other two unrepresented satires, can be freely expurgated without material injury to the sense and connection of the whole. Mr. Prior's school edition, which the editors do not mention, though it was at least until lately the most commonly used in English schools, contrives to retain nearly 600 lines of this satire, while rejecting all that an edition of the kind ought to be without.

The introduction, by Mr. Pearson, is a well-written and interesting piece of literary criticism. A special feature in it and indeed in the whole book is the amount of illustration from French literature—illustration which is often ingenious and interesting. Some will perhaps dissent from the conclusion that Juvenal was the one true poet of his day. According to our current ideas and definitions it is difficult to justify the claim of any writer of the Flavian age to that title; and, if we are to make comparisons, it

can hardly be maintained that in point of style and purity of language Juvenal ranks as high as Martial. One thing is certain however that Juvenal has always had plenty of admirers, so much so that with Tacitus he has come to represent to the general reader the literature of his age. On the literary connection of Juvenal with Martial there is a separate essay in which the views of Professor Nettleship are given. The essay does not seem to prove much in face of the fact that Martial, while constantly speaking of the literary achievements of his friends, never mentions the satires of Juvenal. For his silence concerning Statius, which might seem to be a parallel case, there were special reasons, as Friedlaender has proved almost to demonstration. There are also two essays on 'the social conditions of the early empire' and on the Roman *satira*.

The text adopted is that of Otto Jahn, corrected by R. Beer's fresh collation of the great Montpellier manuscript, commonly called the Pithoeanus. Unfortunately it appears that the first volume was printed too soon to admit any of the remarkable variants of Buecheler's new recension of Jahn. Readers of the *Classical Review* have already seen how numerous and important these are. It is to be hoped that no edition after this will offer in sat. viii. 148 *multo sufflamine consul*; and this is only one of many corruptions which Buecheler's edition should finally dispose of. The editors do not seem to suggest any emendations of their own.

The commentary seems to show wide reading and contains a quantity of information of different kinds; but it appears to us the least satisfactory part of the work. Any one proposing to write a commentary on Juvenal is in a peculiar position, because all that can be done for the explanation and illustration of the subject-matter has already been done by Professor Mayor in his great edition. His best plan would be to start with the fullest acknowledgements to that treasure of learning and then to skim it judiciously, rejecting what is useless or excessive for younger students; but he would be able perhaps to add something of his own, chiefly in the way of critical and grammatical notes; for Professor Mayor more commonly gives the sources of grammatical information than the rules themselves. Another more ambitious plan would be possible though perhaps less prudent—to abstain from consulting Professor Mayor at all. The present editors have followed neither of these plans. They are very largely indebted to their predecessor; of this any one can satisfy himself by a comparison of the two commentaries on the first hundred lines; any number of quotations, some from sources like Ammianus Marcellinus and Seneca's tragedies, appear in both without any indication that they have been transferred from the earlier to the later. The editors in their preface pay some vague compliments to the learned Professor; do they think that that formality absolves them from the duty of acknowledging the extent of their obligation? The occasional references in the notes are quite inadequate.

When that part of the commentary, which appears also in Professor Mayor's edition, is subtracted, the remainder is for the most part such that one could very well dispense with it. Take for example the following notes:—

Sat. i. 3. *togatas*. These were opposed to *palliatas*, in which the scene was laid at Athens. Most of the Roman plays were of this nature.

25. *gravis mihi barba sonabat*, 'my beard sounded so grandly.'

26. *pars Niliacae plebis*, 'this spawn of the cannaille of the Delta.'

NOS. V. & VI. VOL. I.

64. Catullus was able to save enough in Bithynia, he tells us (x. 20), *octo homines parare rectos Ad lecticam*.

iii. 78. *miseris*, jussive or concessive use.

85. *baca nutrita Sabina*, 'reared on Sabine fare.'

iv. 16. 'To be sure, he gave a sesterce for every pound.'

154. L. Aelius Lamia was put to death by Domitian. Horace addresses two odes to him.

vii. 26. *pertunde (libellos)*, 'get them devoured.'

viii. 118. *qui saturant urbem*, 'who throng the capital.'

x. 82. *magna est fornacula*, 'many another statue will go into the furnace.'

xii. 5. *extensum petulans quatit hostia funem*. The animal goes quietly, for the rope is trailing at length.

We quote these notes to show the faults by which the original part of the commentary is disfigured. There are wrong translations and inaccurate translations; there are general statements which, to be true, require serious modification; there are grave errors in syntax and chronology. The spelling of Latin words is often wrong: we find such solecisms as *coena*, *annulus*, *milliaria*. There are also faults of mere carelessness: occasionally the notes deal with a different reading from the text (e.g. viii. 90), or with lines which do not appear in the text at all (e.g. x. 306, 313; xi. 162).

There is still room for a school edition of Juvenal, as Professor Mayor's wonderful book is obviously unsuitable for young boys, and he has not yet completed his excellent abridgement of himself. We hope he will yet do so; the ground has certainly not been occupied by this latest edition.

J. D. DUFF.

M. Fabi Quintiliani institutionis oratoriae libri duodecim. Edidit FERDINANDUS MEISTER. Vol. i. lib. i-vi. Cr. 8vo. pp. xii, 289. 1 M. 20 Pf. Vol. ii. lib. vii-xii. pp. iv, 363. 1 M. 50 Pf. Lips. G. Freytag. Prague, F. Tempsky. 1886-7.

FORMS a part of the 'Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum edita curante Carolo Schenkl,' which, though as yet little known in England, deserves encouragement not less than the earlier series of Teubner, Tauchnitz, Weidmann.

The publishers boast, and as regards their part always, as regards their editors' nearly always, with justice, that their editions are distinguished by a text brought up to the level of latest research; by a critical preface and a concise apparatus at the foot of the page; by a handsome, bold type, and good paper; and by a very moderate price.

As yet there have appeared Eurip. Med. Hipp. (Barthold), Herodotus (Holder, not quite complete), Hesiod and Hom. Il. (by Rzach), Hom. Od. (Cauer), hymni epigr. Batrachom. (Abel), Orphica with Procli hymni, hymni magici, etc. (Abel), Plato, apol., Crito, Protag. (J. Král, Phaedo in preparation), Soph. (Schubert). Announced: Demosth. orat. sel. (H. Schenkl or C. Wottke), Lysias (Gerth), Plut. vitae (C. Th. Michaelis), Thucydides (Cwiliński), Xen. (O. Keller).

Of Latin authors Caes. b. g. (Prammer; b. c. by W. Paul announced), Cic. orat. sel. (Nohl), or. and Brutus (Stangl, who also promises de or.), Cic. philosophical works (Schiche; Lael., Cato, off. are on sale), Corn. Nep. (two edd. one by Andresen, one by A. Weidner), Curtius (abridged, by M. C. P. Schmidt), Eutrop. and Festi brevium (Wagener), Hor. (Keller and Häussner; the odes also by Petschenig), Livy (Zingerle, the second decade on sale), Ov. (met. by Zingerle; fasti, tr., Ibis, Pont., hal., fragm. by O.

M

Güthling; the remaining poems by Sedlmayer have not yet appeared), Sall. (Catil., Iug. orat. epist. cet. by Scheindler), Tac. (J. Müller), Verg. (Klouček). Announced: Sen. rh. (H. J. Müller), Tibullus (Zingerle).

In connexion with the texts illustrated school dictionaries have appeared by K. Jahr to Andresen's, by Weidner to his own, Nepos; by Jurenka to Sedlmayer's selections from Ovid; by Pramner to his Caes. b. g.; by Schmidt to his Curtius; by Ed. Wolff to Tac. Germ.

Meister's book is the more welcome because the only cheap rival (Bonnell's) dates from 1854. He has long been known as a student of Quintilian, inasmuch that Bonnell left to him by will a collation of cod. Bamberg. M 4 14 (saec. x); and he has received important aid from Becher, Kiderlin, Wölflin and Karl Schenkl. He naturally follows in the main Halm's constitution of the text. He has examined nearly all the editions of his author, and endeavours to assign each emendation to its proper owner. In the *addenda* he has registered a conjecture of Nettleship's, which appeared only last year in the *Journal of Philology*. The index of names and things (pp. 298-338) and that of authors cited will be found very useful. The tenth book is also issued separately, price 25 Pf.—JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

Herodoti Historiae, Recensuit ALFRED HOLDER, vol. I. [Lib. I.-IV.] Lipsiae sumptus fecit G. FREYTAG, mdcccxxxvi. 2 Mk.

THIS moiety of the Muses of Herodotus forms a volume of the *Bibliotheca scriptorum Gr. et Rom. ed. curante Carolo Schenkl*. The book is convenient in shape, well printed on fair paper, and pleasant to read. Its price is extremely moderate (two marks). Every student of Herodotus will be glad to possess a copy of this admirable recension, even if already familiar with the editions of Stein and Kallenberg-Dietsch, and will look forward to its speedy completion with interest. In no other edition will be found so fully and conveniently recorded the latest results of textual criticism in regard to Herodotus. The apparatus submitted to each page includes the conjectural emendations for which *Maeniosyne* and other periodicals must be searched at length. Here may be seen what Cobet, van Herwerden, Madvig, Gompertz and others, over and above the elder and later editors, have done for the destruction and reconstruction of the text. A large number of emendations are received into the editor's text. Probably in this respect the edition is an advance upon its predecessors. The result is an eminently rational and flowing text, as near, perhaps, in essentials as we are likely to get to the lost *codex archetypus*. The MSS. variations are also more fully exhibited than in Stein's smaller edition, and that by an ingenious system of references, wherein $\alpha = A + B$, $\beta = R + V'$, $V' = V + S$. This method keeps the two main textual sources into which the archetype descended vividly before the reader. *Exempli gratia*, I. 1 *κατὰ τὸν δὲ τὸ καὶ Ἑλλήνες κ.τ.λ.* $\alpha\beta$ read δ *καὶ*. Not infrequently α omits, β inserts, or *vice versa*. Examples *passim*. A striking case II. 102, 8 α reads *τῶν*, β omits. Valckenauer reads *ἀστῶν*, Schweighäuser *Αἰγυπτίων*, Gaisford *αὐτῶν*, Stein *τῶν* (*ἦρχε*). This last is Herodotean, cp. III. 1 *et al.* but hardly appropriate *in loco*. Holder omits with β . The principal collation made by the editor for the present edition is the collation of V (Vindobonensis lxxxv. lent to him at Karlsruhe: shades of Bodley, take note!). Stein remains in this respect our greatest benefactor. The last collation of S (Sancroft's MS. at Emman. Coll. Camb.) is still Gaisford's.

Some points of interest may be noted, out of many, suggested by this edition.

In II. 51, 12 Holder brackets *Σαμοθρίκες*. There is MS. authority for its omission, which does not appear. In I. 72, 11, II. 31, 6, IV. 153, 5. Prof. Mahaffy's happy emendations of the numerals are accepted. In the first case, somewhat inconsistently, the literal notation (*ιε*) is printed in the text. In I. 51, 14 Kirchhoff's *Λακεδαιμονίων φασὶν ὅν* after *Λακεδαιμονίων* is not noticed. In I. 170, 14 our last editor does not help us (cf. Blakesley *in loco*). In II. 40, which presents a veritable hornet's nest to the textual critic, Holder's text admits substantially Stein's conjecture for filling a lacuna which Stein was the first to indicate. In I. 28-29, 1, can the text be considered satisfactory as left by Holder following Stein? In I. 43, 3 Holder lets *τὸ ὅρος* stand. In IV. 79, 6 and 81, 6 it is remarkable that *καλ-εἶχον* should stand unchallenged; and so perhaps also IV. 124, 1, cp. with 126, 7 *πανσόμενος τοῦ δρόμου*, and with *πανσόμενος τῆς πλάνης* in line 5. In III. 9, 13 α gives *σάωσι β* gives *πορίζωσι*. Stein does not think the variation worth noticing and reads *σάωσι*. Holder reads *σάωσι*. Similarly in III. 14, 42, where C apparently has *σάωειν*. In regard to the method of reference, the lines of this text are numbered not according to the page, but according to the chapter. It may be regretted by those who use classical texts mainly for material or historical purposes that the paragraphs in the chapters are not numbered, as in the Oxford text; a method which greatly facilitates references for such purposes.

It is right to notice that the number of misprints in this volume is considerable. About forty may be added to the list of *Corrigenda operarum menda* at the end. Some of these are trifling, the omission of a breathing, or accent, or of an obvious letter; others are more serious, though not likely to create a difficulty for any intelligent reader. Still they are disfiguring to a text in all other respects so truly admirable. e.g. Bk. I. c 8, line 7 for *χόνον* read *χρόνον*, c 41, 6 for *χρηστοῖσι* read *χρηστοῖσι*, 96, 12 for *παῖτα* read *ταῦτα*, 108, 14 *dele* comma after *ἄλλους* and in 117, 16 after *τάδε*, 143, 15 for *τῇ* read *μὴ*, 149, 7 for *ἀμείρω* read *ἀμείνω*, 161, 2 for *ἀεσπρέτετο* read *ἐσπρέτετο*, 196, 24 for *χρυσίου* read *χρυσίον*. Bk. II, 44, 12 for *ἀνικέμεν* read *ἀνικέμεν*, 47, 7 for *δ* read *δε*, 53 lines 2 and 3 *ad fin.* the punctuation has been exchanged. 155, 2 for *νοῦ* read *τοῦ* 161, 11 for *ὄν* read *ἀν*, 170, 2 for *τ'* read *τὸ*. Bk. III. 19, 12 *ναυ* should be *ναυ* and next line *Πέρσης* should be *Πέρσησι*, 29, 10 *dele* fullstop after *τοῦτον*, 62, 11 *ο* should be *δ*. Bk. IV, 62, 10 for *νοῦ* read *τοῦ*, 68, 9, 10 (*οὐ μόντις*) is superfluous, 128, 6 *dele* *δε*, 134, 19 for *γῆν* read *τῆν*, 141, 3 for comma after *Μιλήσιον* put a full stop. Next line for *παῖτα* read *ταῦτα*, 154, 6 and 7 one *εἶναι* is superfluous, 159, 5 for colon substitute comma after *καλεομένου*. As in many of the best Greek texts printed in Germany, the type seems worn, or imperfectly inked at places. In the copy before me Bk. I, c 109, p. 56 is very badly printed, and the same remark applies to c 17, p. 8. Still one cannot expect an *édition de luxe* for two shillings, and nothing here said should be taken to detract from the great and substantial value of this most serviceable and scholarly edition.—R. W. MACAN.

Herodoti Historiarum Liber Quintus. Scholarum in usum edidit ALFRED HOLDER. (Leipzig: Freytag. 1887). *Eiusdem*. Liber Sextus.

WE have here from the same editor two books of Herodotus, published separately, and at a very small price (40 Pf. each). The *apparatus criticus* is absent, in other respects the page is uniform with the critical

edition of the first four books, and very much more correctly printed. Each book is furnished with a summary of contents in Latin, and the sixth has a plan of Marathon to illustrate the battle. The story of Demaratus (VI. 59-70) is rearranged, and purged of those passages, which are no reproach to 'The Father of History,' but are perhaps better omitted in school reading. The text presented is less conservative than Stein's. In VI. 105 Holder boldly reads $\Phi\lambda\alpha\pi\pi\iota\delta\eta\varsigma$, which indeed must be right, though Stein has not admitted it into the text. VI. 98 Holder omits altogether; this is a strong measure, probably not to be repeated in the critical edition. These inexpensive and excellent editions of the fifth and sixth books of Herodotus, which probably fit in with school work better than the earlier books, and present less of difficulty at least on the historical side, may be most heartily recommended to those engaged in teaching Greek to boys and girls.—R. W. M.

Ovidii Metamorphoses. Ed. A. ZINGERLE. 1 M. 25 Pf.

Fasti, Tristia, Ibis, Ex Ponto, Halieutica, Fragmenta. Ed. O. GÜTHLING. 2 M.

Carmina selecta. Ed. H. SEDLMAYER. 80 Pf.

The series of Greek and Latin texts published by Freytag, of which these form a part, deserves to be widely known: the page is broad, the print large, the paper can be written upon with ink; and the price is small. Each volume has an *annotatio critica*, and index of proper names. The part containing the *Heroides* (which has appeared separately) and *Amatory poems* by Sedlmayer is promised. Uniform with the whole is an excellent little volume of selections by Sedlmayer, neatly bound in cloth: and recommended for school purposes to such as prefer the absence of notes.

Zingerle's text of the *Metamorphoses* is based upon M, supplemented where possible by the early British Museum and Berne fragments, in other places by L. The edition is judicious, and distinguished by an infrequency of square brackets and by easiness in the emendations adopted, for which we cannot but feel grateful. Zingerle is conservative on the whole; though numerous emendations are recorded, many of which, though already published in German periodicals, are new to English readers. The best of the editor's own is the convincing *inde incepta for indecepta* (ix. 712): *hosti si tibi sum* (ix. 180) seems hardly necessary: *Hersilia aerias* (xiv. 848) is clever, though not convincing: in xi. 138, Schenkl's excellent *nilens* (for *nile*) is admitted; and the same scholar's *nympha larum inpatiens* (iv. 260) is so ingenious that we cannot but regret the oversight which leads him to propose *ducite en omnia habes* (vii. 509). The larger critical edition promised by Zingerle will be looked forward to with interest.

Güthling's work—which may be obtained in separate parts, *Fasti*, 75 Pf., *Exile poems*, 1 M. 40 Pf.—contains a fresh, though apparently somewhat inexact, collation of the codex Marcianus of the *Tristia*, executed for this edition; a collation of the Wolfenbüttel MS. by Schenkl; and readings from the Monaco excerpts of Politian, supplied by Stangl. The editor's method is eclectic: in the *Fasti* he wisely follows Peter in often allowing the readings of other MSS., especially V, to outweigh those of A. In the *Ibis* Ellis' materials are used, but G is followed more closely than by Ellis. In the *Pontic Epistles* the Hamburg MS. is the basis: where it is deficient two Monaco MSS. are used, one of them freshly collated by Schenkl. The revision of the *Halieutica* is naturally founded upon Birt's monumental work.

In the *Fasti* there is little new: one slight correction (vi. 765); ten lines marked as spurious, a

doubtful gain (ii. 137-138, 367-368, 835-836, iv. 861-862, vi. 43-44); and a conjecture of Schenkl, *iam sacra uerba* (ii. 638). In the *Pontic Epistles* there is more: i. 7, 57 *at for nec*; ii. 2, 60 *illa meos* is suggested; ii. 5, 24 *putet*; iii. 2, 21 *an for aut*; iii. 6, 34 *qui me quod patior*; iv. *existet for existat*. An important mistake is corrected in Korn's facsimile of Gueff. iv. 12, 41.

In the *Tristia* the lucidity of the *annotatio critica* is decidedly superior to anything yet published: of emendations iii. 12, 28 *quaque duras fodiantur*, and v. 12, 19 *ecce for esse* are excellent; v. 8, 11 *naufragium qui mersit* is probable; the others (ii. 59 *una*, iv. 7, 7 *ei*, ii. 66 *rara mei*, iii. 5, 53 *uenturum*) seem uncertain. Unfortunately there are signs of hasty work, which has led the learned editor into some errors here recorded for correction. In iii. 3, 21 *Madv's pāletur*; in iii. 11, 43 Schenkl's *et for sed*, each involving a false quantity, should not have been mentioned. In iv. 7, 23 a hasty hint of Riese's has caused '*rara uenisse manus*' to appear in the text as the end of a pentameter. In iii. 12, 1 the unmetrical *Macotis* in the text should be corrected to *Tomitis*, as appears from the index. The following inaccuracies in reporting the readings of MSS. are due no doubt largely to the press under which collating has often to be executed by scholars whose circumstances straiten the time they would otherwise gladly employ; and liberal indulgence will be made by all who know the difficulty of such thankless labour. ii. 55 G has *hunc animum*: ii. 91 L has *prodesset honesti not prodesset et honesti*: ii. 92 L³ has *redditur et not redditur at*: ii. 138 should read *paruaque G¹ paruaque G²*: ii. 145 *utque* (for *usque*) not *atque* is read by L¹: ii. 191 *Neuraque* ascribed to Reise is the conjecture of Merula: ii. 239 Merkel reads *fuisse not fuisset*: ii. 278 *abrogat not arrogat* is read by φ: ii. 285 *eadem* is read by L as well as G: ii. 305 *inrupt* is no MS. reading, but the conjecture of Merkel: ii. 337 L has *delectare not detractare*: ii. 403 L has *peli not peliae*: ii. 474 L has *figere not fingere*: ii. 492 L has *quedā n ulli* not *quae damno ulli*: ii. 565 *scriptis* conjectured originally by T. Faber, and since found to be the reading of L, is incorrectly described as Merkel's emendation: iii. 1, 39 *apposita*, not *opposita*, is the reading of G: iii. 4, 57 G has *errat not errant*: iii. 5, 55 L has *hoc not hos*: iii. 6, 16 L has *bonae not bonum*: iii. 9, 32 *retardet not moretur* is the reading of Merkel ed. min.: iv. 1, 21 L has *inter not nec inter*: iv. 2, 53 L¹ has *canentes*: iv. 3, 42 LG have *corpora not pectora*: iv. 4, 34 L has *auctori not auctori sunt*: iv. 4, 76 G has *ab funere not ob funera*: iv. 6, 13 L¹ has *semoventis not remouentis*: iv. 7, 18 the reference to Horace should be *Carm.* ii. 17. No doubt these little blemishes will speedily be removed in a second edition: and then Güthling's work will deservedly rank as the standard—as it is at present the most convenient—text of Ovid's later poems; forming a fit companion to Zingerle's text of the *Metamorphoses*, which is certainly the most satisfactory hitherto published.—S. G. OWEN.

Fontes iuris Romani antiqui, editit C. G. BRUNS.
Edit. Vta, cura TH. MOMMSEN. 8 Mk.

THIS fifth edition of an excellent book comes from the hands of the scholar more capable than any other for this class of work. Mommsen greatly assisted his friend in former editions, and now after Bruns' death has assumed the full responsibility for it. He has done just what might be expected. He has added such laws and documents as have come to light since the fourth edition (1879), and has done all that is possible to verify and ascertain the text. It is

indeed Mommsen's singular merit that he has always set before himself the highest standard of authenticity and accuracy, and spared no pains not only to increase the material for Roman history, law, and literature, but to clear away the growth of fictions and misreadings from material already existing in known texts and inscriptions.

The fourth edition was notably distinguished from the third by including the newly discovered part of the colonial law of Urso (*lex Ursonensis*) n.c. 44; the regulations for the mine at Vipascum and the wax auction-receipts from Pompeii, besides some minor additions. The fifth has a new fragment of a law resembling or identical with the *lex Rubria*, several new *senatusconsulta*, altar-dedications, conveyances, and parts of wills. The texts have all been carefully re-examined with the best editions, the fragments of the praetor's edict have been revised by Otto Lenel, who is the best living authority on the subject, and the extracts from Festus have been compared with fresh collations of the MSS., and in some parts with collations of newly-discovered or re-discovered MSS. For many purposes of Roman law and philology this collection is quite indispensable, and the fifth edition is much better than any of its predecessors. For a small price the legal or classical student has here all that he really requires of the legal monuments which time has spared and we have yet discovered. Mommsen's band of coadjutors and pupils have done much to increase our store, and are fortunately still at work. Chance or purposed search may yet throw up inscriptions, which like the Gortyn tables and some of those in this volume, form distinct additions to our information, and that in the most trustworthy shape.—H. J. R.

C. Vettii Aquilini Iuvenei Libri Evangeliorum IIII. Ad Fidem Codicum Antiquissimorum recognovit CAROLUS MAROLD. Lipsiae, 1886 (Biblioth. Teubneriana), pp. xvii 119. 1 M. 80 Pf.

THE full name of Iuvenius is here given from the Cambridge MS. (C.C.C.C. 304) 'cuius descriptionem a viro ill. H. Bradshaw confectam Zangemeister (*Sitzungsber. d. Kais. Acad. der Wiss. Phil.-Histor. Cl.* 84, 553 seq.) publici iuris fecit.' This MS. is of the seventh century, and is the best of many (ranging from the eighth to the fifteenth centuries) which the editor has consulted. The footnotes give the principal various readings. An index of names, and another of words and grammar (pp. 107-119) complete this most serviceable edition. Huemer, who in vol. ii. of the *Wiener Studien* published critical remarks on Iuvenius, has undertaken to edit him in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*.

J. E. B. M.

Festi breviarium rerum gestarum populi Romani. Edidit CAROLUS WAGENER. Lips. Freytag. 1886. cr. 8vo. pp. xiv, 23. 50 Pf.

This little tract, written A.D. 369 at the bidding of the emperor Valens, long passed under the name of Sextus Rufus, but Wagener has proved that Festus is the only name which the writer bears in the best MSS.

The early editions are for the most part appended to Justin, Florus, Polybius and especially Eutropius, but the slightness of the work has not deterred two excellent scholars from producing independent critical editions of it, viz. Wendelin Foerster (Vindob. 1874 cf. his essay in the *Wiener Studien* ii 303) and Wagener, whose critical preface, digest of various readings and index, leave nothing to be desired. He

is indebted to Karl Schenkl, Friedrich Luedeke and Gustav Monod for collations respectively of the Vienna, Gotha and Paris MSS.—J. E. B. M.

Flavii Cresconii Corippi Africani Grammatici quae supersunt. Recensuit MICHAEL PETSCHENIG. Berlin, Calvary. 1886. 8vo. pp. xii 261. (*Berliner Studien für Classische Philologie und Archaeologie.* Vierter Band. Zweites Heft). Einzelpreis 9 M. 60 Pf.

THE author gives a corrected text with critical apparatus, an 'index nominum et rerum' (pp. 218-230), 'index verborum et locutionum' (pp. 231-260). He is well known as an indefatigable student of the later Latin, and contributed 'Emendations to Corippus' to the *Wiener Studien*, ii-vi (1880-84) and 'Studien zu dem Epiker Corippus' to the *Sitzungsber. der Phil.-Hist. Classe der kais. Akad. der Wiss. in Wien*, 1885, cix 631-668. He has received emendations and other help from (1) Rudolf Amana, author of a dissertation, *De Corippo Priorum Poetarum Latinorum Imitatore*, Oldenb. 1885, (2) M. Manitius, author of an article 'Zu spätlateinischen Dichtern' I. in the *Zeitschr. f. Oester. Gymn.* 1886, pp. 81-101, (3) Karl Schenkl. This must be regarded as the most convenient edition of the text, though it does not supersede the more elaborate edition of Jos. Patsch (in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Berlin, Weidmann, 1879. 4to.).—J. E. B. M.

Virgilii Maronis Grammatici Opera. Edidit IOHANNES HUEMER. Lipsiae 1886. (Biblioth. Teubneriana). pp. xv 177; with 'index auctorum quos citavit Virgilius' (pp. 178-179), 'index nominum' (p. 180), 'index verborum et locutionum' (pp. 181-195). 2 Mk. 40 Pf.

HUEMER is favorably known by his edition of Sedulius (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. x) and of *Cruentini Ars Metrica*; he is engaged on Iuvenius for the same Vienna series. Students of late Latin and lexicographers are greatly indebted to the public spirit of the great Leipzig publisher for issuing, necessarily at a loss, works like *Anthemius*, the prose *Aulularia*, *Cassius Felix*, *Dares*, *Dictys*, *Fabulae Romanae*, *Historia Apollonii*, *Martianus Capella*, *Plinius et Gargilius Martialis*, *Soranus*, and this grammarian *Virgilius Maro*. Beside the Neapolitan MS. iv A 34 (saec. ix or x) of the *Epitomae* and *Epistolae*, which Mai (*Class. Auct.* v 1-149, *append. ad Opera edita ab A. Maio*, Romae, 1871, p. 113-166) used, Huemer has employed several MSS. of the *Epitomae*, and has had the help of his former teacher, W. v. Hartel. The value of the book (cited e.g. by Beda) lies not in the citations, professedly taken from Cicero ('non Arpinas,' as the index quietly remarks), Horace, Lucan et al., but in the barbarous vocabulary, of which only samples are collected in the index.—J. E. B. M.

MONUMENTA GERMANIAE HISTORICA inde ab anno Christi quingentesimo usque ad annum millesimum et quingentesimum edidit societas aperiendis fontibus rerum Germanicarum medii aevi. Berlin, Weidmann. 4to.

THE title of this series tends to obscure its interest for scholars and divines. Each volume has an introduction, parallel passages and various readings under the text, and elaborate indexes of authors cited, subject matter, latinity, etc. In many cases a critical recension of texts appears here for the first time, or after a neglect of two centuries or more.

The readers of the Review can procure elsewhere a list of volumes coming lower down than the *aetrum*

Carolinum, which forms a convenient termination for this brief notice. The names of the editors and of the society which they serve, guarantee the excellence of the work. It is printed in two forms on writing paper and on ordinary paper. The price of the latter is given in brackets below.

The first section '*AUCTORES ANTIQUISSIMI*' comprises as yet :

Tom. I pt. 1. SALVIANI *Presbyteri Massiliensis libri qui supersunt. Recensuit CAROLUS HALM*. 1877. pp. vii 176. 7 M. 50 Pf. (5 M.).

Tom. I pt. 2. EUGIPPI *vita Sancti Severini. Recensuit et adnotavit HERMANNUS SAUPE*. 1877. pp. xvii 36. 2 M. 40 Pf. (1 M. 60 Pf.).

Tom. II. EUTROPII *breviarium ab urbe condita cum versionibus Græcis et PAULI LANDOLEFIQUE additamentis. Recensuit et adnotavit H. DROYSEN*. 1879. pp. lxxii 430. 24 M. (16 M.).

Tom. III pt. 1. VICTORIS VITENSIS *historia persecutionis Africanæ provinciae sub Geisericō et Hunrico regibus Wandalorum. Recensuit CAROLUS HALM*. 1879. pp. x 90. 4 M. 60 Pf. (3 M.).

Tom. III pt. 2. CORIPPI *Africani grammatici libri qui supersunt. Recensuit IOSEPHUS PARTSCH*. 1879. pp. lxii 195. 12 M. (8 M.).

Tom. IV pt. 1. VENANTI HONORI CLEMENTIANI *Fortunati presbyteri Italici opera poetica. Recensuit FRIDERICUS LEO*. 1881. pp. xxvii 427. 18 M. (12 M.).

Tom. IV pt. 2. VENANTI...*opera pedestria. Recensuit BRUNO KRUSCH*. 1885. pp. xxiv 144. 9 M. (6 M.).

Tom. V pt. 1. IORDANIS *Romana et Getica. Recensuit THEODORUS MOMMSEN*. 1882. pp. lxxiii 200. 12 M. (8 M.).

Tom. V pt. 2. D. MAGNI AUSONII *opuscula. Recensuit CAROLUS SCHENKL*. 1883. pp. lxiv 302. 15 M. (10 M.). In this edition the spurious works are separated from the genuine.

Tom. VI pt. 1. Q. AURELI SYMMACHI *quæ supersunt. Edidit OTTO SEECK*. 1883. pp. cviii 352. 22 M. (15 M.).

Tom. VI pt. 2. ALCIMI ECDICII AVITI *Viennensis episcopi opera quæ supersunt. Recensuit RUDOLPHUS PRIPER*. 1883. pp. lxxvi 376. 18 M. (12 M.).

Tom. VII. MAGNI FELICIS ENNODI *opera recensuit FRIDERICUS VOGEL*. 1885. pp. lxiv 420. 20 M. (13 M.).

Of another section '*POETARUM LATINORUM MEDII AEVI*,' have as yet appeared :

POETAE LATINI AEVI CAROLINI.

Tom. I. *Recensuit ERNESTUS DUEMMER*. 1881. pp. 652. 25 M. 50 Pf. (17 M.).

Contains e.g. Bonifatii carmina. Appendix carminum Anglicorum. Iosephi Scotti carmina. Alcuin carmina.

Tom. II. *Recensuit ERNESTUS DUEMMER*. 1884. pp. vi 722. 28 M. 50 Pf. (19 M.).

Tom. III pt. 1. *Recensuit LUDOVICUS TRAUBE*. 1886. pp. vi 265.

Contains e.g. Sedulii Scotti carmina. Part 2, by A. G. HARSTER, containing the indexes, will shortly appear.

Of another section published by Hahn at Hannover in the same form we have :

SCRIPTORES RERUM MEROVINGICARUM.

Tom. I. GREGORII TURONENSIS *opera. Ediderunt W. ARNDT et BR. KRUSCH*. 1884-5. pp. ix 964.

A most valuable help to the study of late Latin, with very complete indexes.

SCRIPTORES RERUM LANGOBARDICARUM ET ITALICARUM SAEC. VI-IX. Hannover, Hahn. 4to. pp. vi 636.

Contains *inter alia* 'Pauli historia Langobardorum eidentibus L. Bethmann et G. Waitz' and 'Agnelli qui et Andreas liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis ed. O. Holder-Egger.'

Another important series contains the *LAWS*, Hannover, Hahn. 4to.

LEGUM SECTIO II. CAPITULARIA REGUM FRANCORUM. *Denuo edidit ALFREDUS BORETUS*.

Tom. I. 1883. pp. xii 462.

LEGUM SECTIO V. FORMULAE MEROWINGICI ET KAROLINI AEVI. *Accedunt ORDINES IUDICIORUM DEI. Edidit KAROLUS ZEUMER*. 1886. pp. xx 782. Invaluable for an editor of Ducange—J. E. B. M.

The Odyssey of Homer, I.—XII. Translated into English verse. By the EARL OF CARNARVON. Macmillan & Co. London. 1886. 7s. 6d.

It is no small praise to say of a translation that it is exact, and elegant, and readable; and so much may be said of Lord Carnarvon's version of the first half of the *Odyssey*. Yet it is a very inadequate representation of Homer. Where then is its fault? This may be found we think, in the second of the three epithets that we have applied to it. It is elegant, most un-Homerically elegant. We take, for instance, from the description of the second stream in the Garden of Alcinoüs, the phrase "yields the citizens its limpid wealth." The Greek is *ἵδεν ὑδρεύοντο ποταμοῖς*, a simple, direct expression as unlike as possible to such a very 'Virgilian' phrase, if we may so say, as 'limpid wealth.' A little further on comes the passage where Odysseus tells his host with an almost brutal plainness that whatever a man's sorrows, he must yet eat. Mr. Lewis Way gives it thus:—

'For no such shameless thing as the ravening belly is found,
For it biddeth us bear it in mind, and by strong constraint we are bound,
Though never so much woe-worn, heart-laden with anguish sore,
Even as the anguish of heart that is mine; yet this evermore,
This shameful, shameless thing, crieth on me to eat and to drink,
Bidding me fill it, and suffers me not of my trouble to think.'

This is really Homeric, though perhaps a little exaggerated. But Lord Carnarvon polishes it into this:—

'there is nought
E'en to the trouble-laden, as the sting
Of hunger, which hath a remembrance keen
In hour of need or sorrow. So the grief
That fills my soul now bids me eat and drink,
And dulls the memory of labours past.'

Instances of the same characteristic defect might be multiplied indefinitely. Perhaps it could hardly have been avoided after the initial mistake of the choice of a metre. To be Homeric in the highly artificial rhythm of blank verse is nothing less than impossible.

How does Lord Carnarvon handle this same metre? Skillfully enough in passages of an elevated kind, in differently in those of the humbler sort, but never, we think, with a thorough mastery. In the quotation already given, the third line, 'Of hunger which hath a remembrance keen,' is distinctly bad, so very weak are the words in the middle of the verse. The line that follows 'limpid wealth,' is, to say the least, feeble—

'Such gifts the gods gave to Alcinoüs.'

Here is a specimen of the translator's better manner:—

'On the broad hearth the goodly flame burnt bright,
And through the isle was wafted far and wide
The scent of frankincense and cedar log.
Within she sat; and bending o'er the loom
Wrought with her golden shuttle on the web,
And ever as she wrought sang with clear voice.
Around that grotto grew a goodly grove,
Alder and poplar and the cypress sweet;
And there the deep-winged sea-birds found their
home,
And owls and hawks and long-tongued cormorants,
Who joy to live upon the briny flood.
And o'er the face of that deep cave a vine
Wove its wild tangles and its clustering grapes,
Four fountains too, each from the other turned,
Poured their white waters, whilst the grassy meads
Bloomed with the parsley and the violet's flower.'

The Odyssey of Homer. Done into English verse by
WILLIAM MORRIS. Vol. I. (Reeves and Turner). 12s.

In view of the ideal arrangement that a poem should be translated by a poet, one is apt to overlook that humble virtue of accuracy which requires nothing more than industry backed by an adequate amount of scholarship. It is in this that, while examining with some care one of the books (the seventh) which he has translated, we find Mr. Morris somewhat wanting. His most serious mistake is in ll. 318, 9, where Alcinoüs promises that Odysseus should be sent home, and adds that he shall be asleep while the rowers do their work.

τῆμος δὲ σὺ μὲν δεδμημένος ὕπνῳ
λέξεις οἱ δ' ἐλώσσι γαλήνῃν, κ.τ.λ.

Mr. Morris has—

'So lie down meanwhile, thou heavy laden
with sleep,
They shall drive through the calm of the sea-flood'
etc;

apparently taking λέξεις for λέξω, and, what is not less serious, forgetting the important part that this sleep of Odysseus on shipboard plays in the story. In 261 the chronology of the story is upset by the version

'But when the ninth year of my sojourn round his
circling course had won.'

Ninth is, of course, a mere lapse of the pen; the other error is more important, ἐπιπλόμενον ἦλθε means something like 'approaching came,' or, we might say, 'was just come.' Odysseus was exactly seven years in his island prison: with the eight came the prospect of escape. In the description of the women weaving we have the line

'A-sitting e'en as the leaves are of the poplars high
o'erhead.'

One explanation of the simile, it is true, makes it to be a likening of the crowd of women to the number of leaves, but there can be no question about the superiority of that which refers it to the swift glancing of their hands, or, possibly, of the shuttles. In 232 *ἔντα δαυτός* does not mean 'remnants of the feast' but 'furniture of the feast,' the 'banquet-year,' as Mr. Way puts it. 'Sleep that had no limit' is not a happy rendering of *ὕπνον ἀτέλῳνα* making it far too like *ἀτέλῳνα* (a resemblance already so strong that *ἀπῆμονα* has been conjectured). Mr. Way's 'deep, deep sleep' is better, as is also his 'swift white flame of the levin' than 'thunder white.' In 81 *Ἐρεχθῆος πυκινὸν δόμον* can scarcely be rendered by

'Erechtheus' homestead and his steadfast house.' It must mean the temple which Erechtheus built.

When we come to speak of the literary merits of Mr. Morris' translation we enter on debatable ground. He uses a peculiar dialect which can only be ironically defended by the allegation that the Homeric dialect also, like Spenser's in English, is a cento of usages which never prevailed at any one place and time. In his very first line he employs what we cannot but think the most unhappy equivalent of 'Shifty' for *πολύτροπος*. 'Shifty' has a sinister signification which does not attach to the substantive 'shift,' so that 'shifty' will not pass as a substitute for 'of many shifts.' Then we have such phrases as 'Thunder-fain,' to 'flit' used apparently for to 'carry' and to 'work' (the Phaeacians are said to have 'flitted' Rhadamanthus and the women 'flit' their work), 'cornkind,' 'black-cloudy,' 'sheer out-thrusting nesses,' 'sheep-kind,' etc. But these, it may be said, are petty criticisms; what is the impression made by the whole? Briefly this—that there is much delicate workmanship, much sweetness of rhythm and melody, many *lumina verborum*, but that there is a want of clearness and rapidity and sometimes a want of force. In these it is inferior to Mr. Way's work, but it has an inspiration to which its older rival cannot pretend. But the reader shall have such an opportunity as our space allows of judging for himself.

'Seven days and ten did I sail, and passed the salt-seas o'er,
But on the eighteenth day showed the shadowy mountain shore
Of your land, and thereat, poor wretch! the heart rejoiced in me.
But yet of the plenteous trouble yoke-mate was I to be
Which Poseidon the Earth-shaker against my life did raise;
For he stirred up the winds against me, and bound me aback from my ways,
And piled up a sea most monstrous, whose swell would not suffer me
To be borne along bemoaning and still on the raft to be.
Then the storm-blast scattered it wide, and swimming on I clave
The mighty gulf of the sea-flood until the wind and the wave
Had borne me on and brought me to this your land anigh;
But the swell as I strove to land 'gainst the sea-cliffs mightily
Drove on perforce, and my body in an ugly place would have cast.
But back I went a-swimming until I came at last
To the river, and there indeed at the place that was most to my mind
All smooth of rocks, and sheltered against the drift of the wind,
I fell ashore, gathering my spirit; but the Deathless Night came on,
And thence I gat me away; from the Zeus-fed river I won,
And lay me down to sleep in the thicket, and the leaves all over me spread,
And sleep that had no limit the God about me shed.
There then amidst the leafage, despite my sorrow sore,
Nightlong I slept till morning and the hindmost day was o'er,
And the Sun again was setting when sweet sleep went from me.

Then the handmaids of thy daughter on the beach
there did I see
All a-sporting; and amidst them as a goddess was
she fair.
I besought her; and surely of wisdom hath her
soul a goodly share,
Nor indeed could one ever be hoping on a youngling
thus to hit
Would do as she; since the younger be ever wanting
in wit.'

MODERN LATIN VERSE FROM MOSCOW
AND BERLIN.

1. *Στρέψας. Carmina sua Graeca et Latina.* THEODORUS KORSCH. Copenhagen. Gyldendal.
2. *Cupressi.* C. A. ULRICH.

THE first of these is a collection of Latin and Greek odes and epigrams, some original, some translations. The author is happiest in his imitations of Martial, and so life-like are the touches that one is tempted to think Bianor has an original in Russia. There is rough vigour in a translation of Puschkin (lxviii.), in the style of an Horatian epode; and No. vi., an ode of congratulation to a fellow-professor, is full of graceful feeling. Our space only permits us to quote a short average specimen, which may be enough however to show the writer's ease of versification:—

'Commendo tibi, docte Thore Langi,
Quam scripsi modo disputationem.
Haec si digna tibi videtur esse,
Quam Madvigius, omnium magister,
Cenatus legat aut recens lavatus,
Cum cessant animi subinde motus
Mensque odit gravibus vacare curis,—
Hunc, inquam, nisi respuis libellum,
Per te moenia visat Hauniana,
Ut sit mnemosynum, licet pusillum,
Ex quo vivere me sciant sodales.'

The Greek epigrams are generally archaic in style and language, and do not strike us as of equal merit with the Latin. The little volume well deserves perusal by Englishmen who are interested in this branch of scholarship, and who are perhaps too much disposed to regard it as scarcely existing out of their own country.

We cannot speak equally highly of *Cupressi*, elegies in memory of the late King of Bavaria, by C. A. Ulrichs. They are written for the most part in an anapaestic metre, for examples of which we must go far down in the silver age, and might fail even there in finding its exact prototype.

La Vie des Mots, par ARSÈNE DARMESTETER. Paris, Librairie C. H. Delagrave, 1887. 2 fr.

THIS little book is the outcome of five lectures delivered at the Sorbonne in 1885, and presents certain general conclusions arrived at by the author during his special study of the French language. It is not an historical account of changes in the meaning of words but an inquiry into the relation of words to the ideas they express, and the conditions which underlie the evolution of meaning. In a short introduction the author has stated the problems of linguistic science and its methods. At each period of its history a language is in a state of equilibrium between the conservative influence of custom and tradition and the revolutionary working of Phonetic Change and Analogy. Where the tradition is fixed as in Classical Latin, which ignored the changes of popular speech, the language dies. Where there is no fixed tradition, language can

change, as with some savage tribes, from generation to generation so quickly that the old cannot understand the young.

Of the destructive agencies, Phonetic Change embraces the changes of sound which can be traced in the history of languages, whether considered singly or in groups—changes produced so regularly that the laws, under which they are generalized, may be regarded as without exception. The principle of Analogy or Association on the other hand is psychological in its character. Under this principle men replace variety by uniformity, alter older systems of inflexion and create new words. In French for instance *nous amons* once stood beside *il aime*, and *il trueve* beside *nous trouons*. In modern French the tenses are uniform throughout. By Analogy a special mode of formation becomes favourite. Thus on the analogy of *imbutus*, *cognodutus* takes the place of *cognitus* and gives rise to the French *connu*. The working of Analogy may be traced not only in inflexions and the formation of words but in the constructions of Syntax as well.

The two principles of Phonetic Change and Analogy are of great importance in the history of modern Philology, particularly as regards the ancient Classical languages. Yet though accepted in France and Germany they have hitherto received but scant recognition in England.

The work of M. Darmesteter is concerned with changes of meaning, not with changes of form. Why is it that new words are created, and that old words receive new senses, while others disappear? These questions the author considers under their logical, psychological and philological aspects. Under logical conditions he applies the figures of the grammarians, *συνεκδοχή, μετωνυμία, μεταφορά, κατάχρησις* to the transformations of meaning in French words. All these changes are embraced under the processes of *rayonnement*, by which such a word as *root* is extended to a whole series of different meanings, and *enchainement* by which a word loses touch of its primitive meaning and is transferred to other objects, as for instance in the case of *mouchoir*.

From the psychological side we have to consider the effect on language of the changes of thought and feeling brought about by great historical events; or again the effects of national and race characteristics, as for instance in the want of abstract terms in Hebrew, or the connection of the idea of falsity with the number *two* in Aryan languages. Under this head too come the effects of want of precision or grossness in popular notions, as seen in the wavering sense of terms of colour or the depravation of such terms as *philosophe, sophistiqué, jovial*.

In the latter portion of the book the author considers the action and reaction of words upon one another—how for instance *point* and *rien* have lost all positive meaning because of their restriction to set phrases, how one word ousts another as when *falloir* takes the place of the older *estover* and *convenir*, and yet again how synonyms exist side by side.

Lastly he touches on the reasons of the disappearance of words. Ten 4to volumes contains the disused terms of the French language. Some disappeared along with the object and ideas which they expressed; others because they were not clear or did not please. The Latin *ire* has left no *ir*, French uses *aller*; *verum* has left *vrai* but *veru* and *virum* have left nothing. In trying to find an equivalent for English *maid* French has passed from *garce* to *fille*, and from *fille* to *une jeune personne*.

To M. Darmesteter Language is an organism passing through an endless succession of develop-

ments. Language has its fossil remains of past formations now disused. In Language too we find a struggle for existence continually going on, and linguistic study is the history of the evolutions through which in different times and places the primitive type has passed.—J. E. KING.

Cours élémentaire d'épigraphie latine, par M. CAGNAT.
Paris: Thorin. 1886. Pp. x. 224. 8vo. 6 fr.

IN his article on 'Roman Inscriptions,' contributed to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in 1881, Hübner complained that there was no text-book of Roman epigraphy in existence. Since then two have appeared, one by Hübner himself in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch* (i. pp. 475-548), the other the one which we have now to review. It consists of two parts, first, 'the elements common to different classes of inscriptions,' which includes the names of men, the *cursus honorum* and the imperial titles (pp. 1-118): second, the different classes of inscriptions (pp. 119-188). There is a 'complementary' chapter on restoring mutilated inscriptions, and a full index. That the book is good we need hardly say. The growth of classical studies in France has been more marked in epigraphy than in anything else, and M. Cagnat is not the least known among French epigraphists. And when his book has received Hübner's approval, what more is there to add? It is of course elementary. We almost think, indeed, it might here and there have been made even more so in detail: the abbreviations O. for Aulus, QV. for Quintus, S. for Servius, and others (pp. 6, 27) are very rare. But with epigraphy in the strict sense of the word—the forms, shapes, and combinations of letters—the book does not deal. There is a note on p. 75 on the accent denoting a long syllable; another on p. 193 just alludes to ligatures: but that is almost all. On the other hand, some parts of the book are not epigraphical in any special sense. The section on the transmission of names (pp. 30-44) corresponds to some of the first section of Marquardt's *Privatleben*, and the *cursus honorum* (pp. 53-97) is part of a *Römisches Staatsrecht*. However, the inclusion of these points does not render the book a bit the less useful, and its lucidity is admirable. There is some want of examples, particularly in the middle of the book, but we understand a supplement is speedily to follow, which will contain them. The print is excellent. At the bottom of p. 18 the reference should be to *Privatleben*, i.—F. HAVERFIELD.

Cours élémentaire de métrique grecque et latine, par LOUIS HAVET, rédigé par LOUIS DUVAU. Paris: Delagrave. 1886. 4 fr.

THIS little treatise gives a trustworthy account of the principal Greek and Latin metres in a popular form. The introduction deals with accentuation and prosody, and distinguishes clearly between the different kinds of accent and quantity. Some rules are given for determining the natural quantity of Latin vowels in syllables which are long by position, a subject which is too often neglected. The bulk of the book consists of chapters on the following subjects: dactylic, anapaestic, trochaic, and iambic verse, the Lesbian lyrical poetry, paeonic and ionic verse, the general principles of choral metres, rhythmical verse in later Greek and Latin poetry. The Greek and Latin hexameter and elegiac are discussed at length, and the peculiarities of Homeric prosody are well stated, though exception might be taken to one or two matters of detail. The principal trochaic and iambic metres are also adequately described, as well as the difference in Latin poetry between the archaic prosody (especially that of the

dramatists) and the prosody of the classical period. The treatment of the lyrical metres is less complete, but so far as it goes, is sound and cautious. Thus, the disputed question of the exact relation between the so-called 'cyclic' dactyl and the trochee in logaedic metres is stated as follows: 'The proper value of each syllable was probably altered a little, so that the strong beats came at equal intervals from one another.' This is a much safer statement than the account of the 'cyclic' dactyl which is now usually given. The theory of the exact correspondences between the rhythmical 'sentences' that form a period in choral metres, i.e. the so-called 'eurhythmy' is wisely passed over without notice in a book which professes only to give ascertained facts. But the chapters on lyrical and choral metres are too short, and such important metres as dochmiacs and dactylo-epitritics should not be relegated to the glossary at the end of the book, where a mere definition is given, without any discussion. The same may be said of the Saturnian metre. In spite however of some omissions, and although some parts require to be more worked up in detail, the book is probably in its present form the best easy introduction to the study of Greek and Latin metres. The style is clear, and the terminology as simple as possible. There are a few misleading misprints, which should be corrected in a second edition.—C. B. HEBERDEN.

Altgriechischer Versbau, ein Versuch vergleichender Metrik, von H. USENER, Bonn, 1887. 2 Mk. 80 Pf.

ARISTOTLE records that theorists in his own day defined the typical hexameter as consisting of seventeen syllables in two divisions, the left division numbering eight, the right nine. It is the chief object of Usener's treatise to show that this theoretical division, viz.

— — — — — | — — — — —

was originally a real one, the hexameter having been formed by the fusion of two lines which, though together making a couplet, were metrically separate. Bergk vainly sought the origin of the Epic metre in a mechanical combination of the 'enoplios' with the so-called 'paroemiac.' The latter term really denotes nothing more than the anapaestic 'marching' verse (adapted for singing *παρ' οἶνον*). Usener, though he rejects Bergk's theory, unfortunately interprets the word as if derived from *παροιμία* (following Hephaestion, ch. 8), and makes use of it accordingly to denote the short verse (*Kurzvers*), which his own theory presupposes. Apart from the name, however, there is no doubt that a verse, corresponding more or less closely to the latter half of the hexameter, very frequently appears as the vehicle of gnomic sayings (e.g. *φιλεῖ δὲ νότος μετὰ πάχυνον*), while similar sentences, embodied in hexameter verse, often take the same metrical form, e.g. Homer's *ῥεχθὲν δέ τε νῆπιος ἔγνω*, and Hesiod's *παθὼν δέ τε νῆπιος ἔγνω*. No less than 115 gnomic sentences of this type have been collected by Meineke, Nauck and others. The inference, that the hexameter was originally composite, is obviously a legitimate one. The fragment of a Linus song preserved by the Scholiast on *Iliad* xviii. 570 is a succession of these wrongly-named 'paroemiacs,' adapted, perhaps, to a circular dance.

Usener derives additional evidence from two sources. First, from the frequent neglect of the digamma in Homer after the caesura, e.g.

πᾶσιν ἐμοὶ δὲ μάλιστα | τοὶ Φίλιψ ἐγγυγάσιν
εἰ δὲ σοὶ πᾶν φέρων | ὑποφείζομαι ὅττι κε φείψης
ἀλλ' ἄγε νῆα μέλαιναν | φερύσσομεν εἰς ἄλα διὰ
ὧς ἔφατ'· Αἰνείας δὲ | Φεκατὴβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα.

Such lines, he supposes, were allowed because of the semi-independence of the concluding half of the hexameter. He would similarly explain some exceptions to the usual lengthening of the vowel before a mute and liquid, e.g.

καὶ ποτὶ τις Φείπει | πᾶτρός γ' ὅδε πολλὸν ἀμείνων
ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα Φείπε | πρὸς Ῥὸν μεγάλῃτορα θυμὸν

On the other hand the unjustified offences of the line

Ζεὺς δὲ πρὸς ὃν λέχος ἦτ' Ὀλύμπιος ἀστεροπητής
conclusively prove the passage (Il. i. 609-11) to be merely a rhapsodist's addition. ποτὶ should of course be written for πρὸς in the formula *Φείπε πτερύοντα* (Cf. Stesichorus fr. 92 ποταύδῃ.)

Secondly, from the hexameters which so often occur in inscriptions, e.g. the common formula of imprecation

ὀρφανά τέκνα λίποιτο | χῆρον βίον, οἶκον ἔρημον

He ingeniously applies the same key to several difficult inscriptions, e.g.

Διογεν[ης] ἀνέθηκεν | Αἰσχέλου ὕδς Κεφ[α]λῆος,

where the demotic designation is transferred to the father and the word for 'son' is added in order to obtain a clumsy verse, in which the second half commences independently (Αἰσχ[η] | ὕλου ὃ | ὕς Κεφαλ- | ῆος. The name is elsewhere written Αἰσχυλλος). Occasionally he goes too far in detecting the primitive metre in personal names, e.g.

Φανοκρίτη | παιδὶ χαρίζομένη
Ἀρχεστράτην | ἀνδρὶ ποθεινοτάτην

The name appears to be often introduced, of necessity, with hardly a semblance of rhythm, as in the well-known inscription on a helmet in the British Museum, in which Hiero dedicates his Etruscan spoils to Zeus: 'Ιέρων ὁ Δεινομένεος—καὶ τοὶ Συρακόσιοι τῷ Διὶ Τυρ(ρ)αν' ἀπὸ Κώμας. He notices with more reason the interpolation which sometimes appears, as in the metrical inscription on a ἀλτήρ recently found at Eleusis:

Ἀλ(λ)όμενος νίκησεν | Ἑπαίνετος οἶνεκα τοῦδε

That the hexameter originated in a couplet, the conclusion of which is represented by the verse in question, is rendered highly probable by the analogy now established between the Greek Epic metre and the primitive metres of other European nations, together with the more rudimentary structure of the Vedic hymns and the Zend-avesta. The latter was first analysed by Westphal, who showed that it consists of lines arranged in pairs, each line having four beats, commencing with a light syllable and ending with the ictus. Professor Allen has already traced the old German ballad-metre to the same source. In this the first or light syllable was dropped, so as to give a trochaic rhythm, and the syllable preceding the final ictus suppressed (as sometimes in the Indian metre). Usener's investigation extends to the primitive songs of the Czechs, Poles, Russians, Servians, etc., and his conclusion is that 'they all started from the short verse of eight syllables, and all alike accented it by the four beats.' The connection of the Greek metre with the Vedic is the more manifest, as both depend on quantity and not, like the German, on accent. Its relation to the Saturnian verse is noticed in my article on 'the Aeolic element in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.'

Usener's view of the Aeolian metres favours the suggestion, which I have there offered, as to their affinity with what may be called the rudiments of the hexameter. The primitive rhythm is discernible, not only in the formal logaedic sequences, but in

the simpler variations preserved in fragments, such as

ἄγε δὲ χέλυ διὰ μοι
πλήρης μὲν ἐφαίνετ' ἂ σελάννα
ἄλλατα μὲν μελιάδεος ἄλλατα δ'
καὶ πλείστοις ἐνάσασε λάοις.

Usener points out also that the Lesbian metres preserved the regular beats and definite intervals, which were alone compatible with the accompaniment of the lyre (the Lesbian instrument *par excellence*), remarking that that instrument in Greece was struck, not twanged. The long-drawn choric rhythms were only made possible by the flute. In the metres adapted to the lyre there is no resolution of the arsis. This principle belongs to the Epic in common with the Lesbian metres, and the reason is that the latter 'had been drawn from the manifold forms of the popular poetry and were shaped at a time, undoubtedly long before Alcæus, when metre was determined by the stringed instrument alone; they faithfully preserved the tradition of a verse-structure, in which the arsis supported the rhythm and the theses were not counted'.—G. C. WARR.

Écriture et Prononciation du Latin Savant et du Latin Populaire, et Appendice sur le chant dit les Frères Arvales, par GEORGES ÉDON, Professeur au Lycée Henri IV. Paris, Librairie Classique Eugène Belin, 1882. 10 fr.

Restitution et Nouvelle Interprétation du Chant dit des Frères Arvales, par GEORGES ÉDON. Paris 1882.

Nouvelle Étude sur le Chant Lémural, par GEORGES ÉDON. Paris 1884. 7 fr. 50.

THE first of M. Édon's books is a very handy and readable summary of all that Corssen, Ritschl, Schuchardt, and subsequent workers in the same field have written about the alphabet, the pronunciation and the accentuation of Latin. M. Édon has read carefully the whole literature of the subject; and his book, though too slight and unoriginal for the special student, may be recommended to any who are content to get their information at second hand. We have in the first chapter an account of the derivation of the Latin alphabet from the Greek, and of the latter from the Phœnician, and ultimately the Egyptian, while with regard to one of the letters, G, we have on p. 145 the interesting information (almost the only original contribution in the book), that the letter is to be found on the *as librale* of Luceria (c. 300-250 B.C.). This was denied by Ritschl and Mommsen, who could only go by hearsay evidence on the subject, since the coin was in a private collection. It has quite recently been acquired by the Naples Museum, and now that it is in public ownership, M. Édon has been able to get a facsimile of it taken (p. 144), which clearly shows that the letter is G and not C. Chapter II gives a very brief account (with specimens) of the various kinds of Latin writing, Capital, Uncial, Cursive, and Minuscule. Chapter III deals with Latin pronunciation in a way that would have been more satisfactory if the contributions of Seelmann, whose book appeared subsequently to M. Édon's, could have been utilized. In Chapter IV we have an extremely good account, with specimens from inscriptions, of the various changes in Latin spelling in the successive centuries of Roman history till the fall of the Western Empire. Chapter V gives the ordinary metrical rules of quantity, while Chapter VI is reserved for the discussion of the law of position, and its violation by Plautus and Terence. The last chapter is devoted to Latin accentuation.

In the Appendix, and in its separate reprint the *Restitution et Nouvelle Interprétation*, &c., we have M. Édouard's extraordinary theory about the Hymn of the Arval Brothers, known to most of us in Mommsen's version. The writing is very bad, and the text full of corruptions, to judge from the variations in the same phrase when repeated, and from the misspellings in the previous part of the inscription, which gives the minutes of the proceedings of the Arval priesthood on May 29, 218 A.D. For example *cathedris* is there spelt *cathedius*, and the unmeaning word *lumemulia* appears a line or two above the hymn:—*ibe (sic) omnia lumemulia cum rapinis acciperunt et deas unguentaverunt et aedes clusae omnes foris exierunt ibi sacerdotes clusi succincti libellis acceptis carmen descendentes (sic) tripodaverunt in verba haec enos lasas iuvate, &c.* We know nothing of the ceremonies referred to in the hymn, and most people are agreed that under the circumstances a restoration of the text is hopeless, although it is surprising in how many books one sees the statement '*pleores = plures*' is found in the Arval Hymn, as if the reading were a certainty. But we do know from a passage in Ovid's *Fasti* v. 435 foll. the ceremonies of the worship of the Lemures. Accordingly M. Édouard has conceived the extraordinary idea of transforming the unknown into a known quantity, the Arval into a Lemural hymn. He reads *Lemuralia* for *lumemulia*, and twists the text into what in ordinary Latin would read—

O nos, Lares, iuvate! His mihi luam fabis; umbra, serpe, incurre iis! Inde foras satur fuge, Lemur: limen sali! (stabit aversim). Manes paterni, adcolate! (cuncti). O! nos, umbra, iuvato! Triumphe.

In his translation:—

O Lares, soyez-nous favorables! Je paierai pour moi avec ces fèves. Ombre, glisse-toi, cours après elles! Maintenant que tu en as assez, fuis hors de ce lieu. Lénure; saute le seul. (On s'arrêtera en tournant le dos). Manes paternels, envollez-vous. (Tous ensemble). O ombre, sois-nous favorable! Triumphe!

How does he effect this violent transformation? He has recourse to Ribbeck's favourite recipe for corrupt lines in Virgil, the theory of 'an archetype written in cursive character.' The statuary, he says, must have copied the hymn from one of the *libelli* mentioned in the lines of the inscription quoted above. The *libellus* was written in the same cursive scrawl as we see on the walls of Pompeii, and he is at pains to show how each word of the inscription could be mistaken for the corresponding word in his text when written in cursive.

Such a theory not unnaturally provoked a storm of criticism, and M. Édouard was called upon to answer such questions as these:

How could *his, fabis* be written *hi, fave*? How could the Arvalian priesthood tolerate the existence of so mistaken an inscription in their temple? How can *Marnar = Umbra*? and so forth. He has accordingly written a second book to justify his theory, the *Nouvelle Étude sur le Chant Lénural*, in which these objections are met with an ingenuity worthy of a better cause. Into his speculations we will not follow him, but content ourselves with expressing our opinion that the theory is not worth a moment's consideration.—W. M. LINDSAY.

Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt. Von Dr. JULIUS BELOCH. (Leipzig, 1886, pp. 520.) 11 Mk.

The subject of population in antiquity has never received more thorough and scientific treatment than

in this work. It contains an attempt to collect and criticize all the available materials, and to deduce results from them in accordance with physical and economic laws. The book falls naturally into two parts; the first two chapters discuss the nature of the evidence which has come down to us, and the method in which it must be employed, while the bulk of the book is occupied with the application of the principles so established to the different states in detail.

Little fresh material has been brought to light; the data, with which Dr. Beloch works, differ little from those used by Böckh and his successors, but the conclusions drawn by him show the widest divergence from those of former historians. In almost every case numbers hitherto accepted have been greatly reduced. Apart from the interpretation of the original authorities, the most important cause of this divergence lies in the different theories held as to the proportion existing between the adult men and the whole body of men, women, and children. For our information as to the population of the various states is usually limited to the number of adult male citizens (as in the Roman census of the republican period), or of men liable to military service. To ascertain, therefore, the total population, we must first establish or assume what proportion these classes bear to the rest; and here the widest differences of opinion exist. Böckh, following Sainte Croix, thought that the relation of free men to the total free population was as 1 to $4\frac{1}{2}$; Dr. Beloch thinks the proportion of 1 to 3 approximate as an average for all ancient states, and quotes in support the analogy of the different European countries to-day, where the children under seventeen form about thirty-seven per cent of the total, while he supposes that they were not more than thirty-three per cent in antiquity. The importance of this question cannot be overrated, as the estimate of Böckh would make the population half as much again as that of Dr. Beloch. On this account it is to be regretted that the latter author has only devoted a few pages to the discussion of the subject, assuming almost without argument that the rate of increase was always less than the present European average. He further assumes the same proportion to exist at different places and periods, in which the circumstances must have varied considerably. For example he calculates the population of Attica in 432, when it was at its highest, on the same basis as in 309 when it was much lower, and had come to a standstill.

One or two instances in which Dr. Beloch's investigations have led to important reductions may be mentioned. He regards the number of slaves in Attica in 309 quoted by Athenæus as impossible, and after an examination of the value of property at the time, of the amount of corn produced and imported, and the statements as to the slaves owned by the rich, argues that 100,000 is a much more probable number than 400,000. Again, he reduces the population of Italy under Augustus, which has been estimated at seventeen millions to about five and a half millions. He holds that the census of Augustus included the total citizen population, not merely the adult citizens; and bases his conclusion on a comparison of this census with the last census of the Republic.

The causes of the decline in population, which set in both in Greece and Italy in the second century before Christ are only suggested; and as this subject is of the greatest interest to the general student of history, it may be hoped that the researches which Dr. Beloch is undertaking for his next volume, may enable him to treat the question more satisfactorily.

The chief value of the book consists in its destructive criticism. Considerations of physical

possibility, such as the amount of corn required to support existence, the density of population in proportion to area, together with more direct arguments are often sufficient to disprove the excessive estimates of former writers. But from the nature of the case, positive conclusions drawn from scanty materials and *a priori* considerations must be in great part hypothetical. Dr. Beloch repeatedly warns us against regarding his results as anything more than approximations to the truth.—L. WHIBLEY.

Vormundschaft nach Attischem Recht. By Dr. O. SCHULTHESS. Freiburg-i-B. 1886. 6 Mk.

Dr. SCHULTHESS divides the subject of 'Guardianship according to Attic Law' into seven sections, each of which he treats in a separate chapter: the Archon as state protector of orphans and the *ορφανοφύλακες* in Xen. *de red.* 2, 7 etc.—state help given to the orphans of those killed in war—names (*ἐπίτροπος* and *κύριος*) and qualifications of a guardian—different kinds of guardians (*testamentarii*, *legitimi*, *dativi*) and their appointment, and in an appendix the *πρόδικος* in Sparta—duties of a guardian—time and mode of the orphan's release from guardianship—litigation which might arise out of guardianship (*εἰσαγγελία κακώσεως*, *φάσις μισθώσεως οἴκου*, and *δική ἐπιτροπῆς*). In an eighth chapter he enumerates the speeches delivered in such actions. Dr. Schulthess has collected carefully the various passages in Greek authors bearing on his subject and discusses fully the opinions held by modern writers on the different questions involved. The material here collected is complete and cannot but prove very useful to scholars, but they will probably prefer in some cases to draw their own conclusions from the information here supplied. In a number of cases I have been unable to follow the reasoning which has led Dr. Schulthess to adopt one rather than another of the conflicting views held by modern scholars; for instance, I cannot but agree with Lipsius in thinking that *ἀποκηρυξίς* was not an Athenian institution (p. 41) and that money belonging to a minor might be lent on *ναυτικὸς τόκος* as well as on *ἐγγειος τόκος* (p. 124); Thonissen seems justified in concluding from Lysias vii, 37 that the accuser in such a law-suit was *ἀκίδνους* (p. 198. n.); and I am inclined too to believe, with Philippi, that there was a second *εἰσέγξις* to the *πρύταρες* (p. 38), of course merely as a religious ceremony (for the civil act took place before the *demolae*), a survival of the ancient Aryan custom (cf. Leist, *Græco-Ital. Rechtsgesch.* p. 68, see also the meaning of *dreihäarig* in old German Law, in *Zeitschr. f. d. Altert.* 1886 p. 352). From C. I. A. ii, 8416 it is clear that *κούρειον* and *μειον* are not the same, as was generally believed on the strength of the Etym. M.; this fact throws a new light on Poll. viii, 107 *φρόταρες . . . καὶ εἰς ἡλικίαν προελθόντων ἐν τῇ καλουμένῃ κουρεώτιδι ἡμέρᾳ ὑπὲρ μὲν τῶν ἀρρένων τὸ κούρειον ἔθουν, ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν θηλειῶν τὴν γαμηλίαν*. The latter part of this passage is of course wrong, Pollux himself giving the correct definition of *γαμηλία* in iii, 42, but the first half seems to me to support Philippi's view. This is surely one more instance where Pollux has been proved by later finds to contain correct information; e.g. every one cast doubt on viii, 93 *εἰσαγωγῆς ἀρχῆς κληρωτῆς ὄνομα* and 101 *οἱ τὰς ἐμμήνου δικας εἰσάγοντες*, until Koehler found their name in an inscription (C. I. A. i No. 37); no one believed in the correctness of viii, 52 *ἔτι δ' ὁ εἰσαγγεῖλας καὶ οὐχ ἑλὼν ἀχήμεος ἦν, ἡγερέδης ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ Λυκάφρονος*, until the papyrus proved it. To return however to Dr. Schulthess, the reader will probably not find *εἰς ἄνδρας τελεῖν* (p. 27, n. 2) 'an unintelligible' expression, and may possibly agree with

me that the statement *τὸν ἄπαδα μὴ στρατηγεῖν* (42. n.) is more likely to have taken its rise from Dinarchus i, 71: *καὶ τοὺς μὲν νόμους προλέγειν τῷ ῥήτορι καὶ τῷ στρατηγῷ . . . παιδοποιεῖσθαι κατὰ τοὺς νόμους* etc., than in the imagination of the scholiasts. These however are small matters, respecting which difference of opinion may well exist; what seems to me the main fault of the book, and one by which its usefulness cannot but be seriously impaired, is its want of precision and clearness on only too many points. Thus Dr. Schulthess says on p. 199: 'It is evident that the *εἰσαγγελία κακώσεως* could not but be *τιμητή* (cf. *Att. Proc.*² p. 227, 359)', and in a note to the former reference he remarks: 'Lipsius ought not to mention only the *εἰσαγγελία* against arbitrators as *τιμητή*, for the same was certainly the case with the *εἰσαγγελία* for the benefit of orphans.' But this is exactly what Lipsius does say, his words being (on the last line of p. 226): 'die beiden letzten (kinds of *εἰσαγγελία* scil. *κακώσεως* and against arbitrators) waren gewiss schlechthin schätzbar.' The note goes on 'Lipsius is likewise wrong (p. 231) in mentioning a *γραφὴ κακώσεως* amongst the *γραφαὶ τιμηταί*, since it is an *εἰσαγγελία κακώσεως* and there never was a *γραφὴ κακώσεως*.' On p. 358 Lipsius observes 'Es ist schwerlich zufällig, dass uns für *κἀκωσις* der Eltern durch ihre Kinder kein Beispiel von *Eisangelie* überliefert ist. . . es war dann der Weg der Schriftklage einzuschlagen' etc. This Dr. Schulthess declares (p. 206) he cannot understand; 'how' he exclaims, 'should this *γραφὴ* be different from the *εἰσαγγελία*? Probably in this, that the parents on not receiving one-fifth of the votes had to pay a fine of 1,000 drachmae. But how should they think of choosing that action, when the other existed by its side? Where is the evidence for this latter assertion? The reader will probably think with me that Lipsius, in the absence of all evidence, is perfectly justified in not speaking of an *εἰσαγγελία κακώσεως γονέων*, especially as he also establishes a difference in the punishment of the offender: those found guilty of *κἀκωσις γονέων* lost their civil rights (p. 360); having thus given his reasons for believing in the existence of a *γραφὴ κακώσεως*, he was right in mentioning it on p. 231. It would be easy to multiply instances of such loose reasoning, see p. 74 on the *tutores dativi*, p. 223 on the private arbitrators, etc. Of course Dr. Schulthess knows that Demosthenes had only a sister, and that Demon was his father's brother; he says on p. 54: am nächsten wäre dem Vater Demosthenes sein Bruder Demon gestanden, but on the previous page, probably set wrong by τῷ μὲν—τῷ δὲ in Dem. xxvii, 4 he speaks of Demophon as a son of Demon who had married the sister of the elder Demosthenes, and of Aphobus as the son of a brother of the elder Demosthenes; and on p. 77 we find: Demosthenes und seine Geschwister. Or is Geschwister a provincialism for Schwester? there are several such in the book, on p. 6 n. 2 erhältlich, p. 145 im Tun sein, p. 151 Zinsen erzeugen, p. 184 Rechnung stellen, p. 188 die Pflicht der Vormundschaft überbinden etc.; at any rate the expression is misleading. The book is not free from confusing misprints, such as *ὑπερβολῆς* for *ὑποβολῆς* (p. 100, n.), Gatten for Garten (p. 119, n. 1).

HERMAN HAGER.

Le Droit public Romain, par Th. MOMMSEN; traduit sur la 2me édition allemande, par P. F. GIRARD. Vol. I. Paris. Thorin. 10 fr.

This is the first instalment of a translation of the whole of MommSEN and Marquardt's 'Handbuch,' undertaken by eminent French *savants* under the direction of M. G. Humbert. It contains the first

350 pages of the first volume of the second edition of the *Staatsrecht*, which, when the translation is completed, will fill no less than five volumes. The director has wisely entrusted the whole of Mommsen's part of the work to a single hand, and M. Girard has fulfilled his task admirably. Though the powerful rough-hewn German of the original naturally loses much by translation, and though the French language is not seen at its best when trying to cope with Mommsen's weighty sentences, the work is probably as well done as it could be, and the translator has had the invaluable help of the author during the greater part of his labour. This gives the volume a value far beyond that of an ordinary translation, and it may be regarded almost in the light of a third edition. No pains have been spared to bring it up to the level of the latest researches and discoveries; and especially the material embodied in the *ephemeris epigraphica*, and Mommsen's own contributions to the subject since the appearance of the 2nd edition, (1876) have been woven into the notes. It may be useful to set down here some of the chief additions; viz. p. 32, the bearing of the Romulus-Remus legend on the principle of 'Collegialität,' from *Hermes*, vol. 16; p. 132, on the *jurisdictio* of the augurs, from *Eph. Ep.* iii. 101; p. 192 foll., on the nature of the State's right of property, from the *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung*, 1885, p. 207, on magisterial fines, from *Eph. Ep.* ii. 205 (C. I. L. ix. 782); pp. 269, 271, on State contracts, from the *Zeitschrift*, as quoted above; p. 340, on the *præfecti fabrum*, from *Eph. Ep.* iv. 538, v. 31; p. 344, on *salaria*, from Dioctetan onwards, from *Eph. Ep.* v. 643, &c.; p. 347, on *consilium in jus privatum*, from *Hermes*, 1885; p. 328, on *scribæ*, from *Eph. Ep.* iii. 108; and p. 329, on *locatio operarum*, from the *Savigny-Zeitschrift*, 1885.

M. Humbert is to be congratulated on this excellent beginning of a great undertaking, which will be of the greatest value not only to French students, but also to Englishmen whose German does not go far enough to cope easily with the original. Paper and print are both superior to those of the German editions; the only misprints I have found are in references to the pages of the *Ephem. Epigr.*, which have been corrected in the foregoing paragraph.

W. W. FOWLER.

Studies in the Literary Records of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century, by CHARLES H. HERFORD, M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, late Berkeley Fellow of the Owens College, Manchester. Cambridge: University Press. 1886. Pp. v.—xxix.; 426. 9s.

HERE is a well-written book shewing signs of industrious work in what have been obscure parts of English literature. It would have pleased 'ingenuous Hone.' I can fancy Lamb opening it in some of the chapters and becoming engrossed therein: forgiving the occasional occurrence of a German name, till he turns over to a chapter about Germany, and in his dislike to making one in a party of 'Dutchmen,' packs it off to Coleridge.

But in the *Classical Review* we have nothing to do with Owlsglass or Dr. Faustus, Friar Rush or Friar Bacon, Luther's hymns or the Trial and Funeral of the Mass. But the rise of the Latin Drama in Germany and England has its interest for the educationalist, and particularly for the classical scholar. In the quaint attempts to moralize Terence we have a testimony to the popularity of Latin literature, as

well as an evidence of the conscientious views and purposes of the age of the Reformation. Mr. Herford shows how as the sixteenth century went on, Seneca became a greater power in Germany, and secular subjects with a tragic treatment came to preponderate over the comedy with a religious motive.

In the annals of Cambridge we trace this less distinctly, partly because so many of the plays which were acted have been lost—even to their very titles, so that it is hard now to realize how large a share the drama had in Elizabethan education: less hard however since the recent elaboration of Greek tragedy. In Trinity College the statutes (1559—60) required of the prelectors the performance of several tragedies and comedies at Christmas. A comedy had been acted there (in the days of Michael-House) in 1386. The *Mundus plumbus* and the *Microcosmus* of T. Artour, fellow of St. John's, are placed by Mr. Herford between 1520 and 1532. The year 1520 was signalized by the first performance of a play of Plautus, probably of any, non-miracle, Latin play at the English Court, and in 1536 the *Plutus* of Aristophanes was performed with the 'reformed' Greek pronunciation at St. John's. In 1545 the subject of pronunciation was dragged-in at the end of an angry letter from the Chancellor (Bp. Gardiner) to M. Parker then Vice-Chancellor, in which he complains, perhaps on the information of Cuthbert Scot (Bp. of Chester, 1556) of the performance in Lent at Christ's College of an expurgated version of Kirchmayer's *Pam-machius*, a comedy about which Mr. Herford has a good deal to tell us. In 1548 there is a play at Queens', and the companies of Protector Somerset and of the King are allowed to perform in King's College hall. In 1556 the 'Lord' of Christ's performs at Christmas. On a Sunday in May 1557, my Lord of Norfolk's players perform in the hall. On the evening of Sunday, August 6, 1564, we have the *Aulularia* of Plautus in King's College chapel before Queen Elizabeth, who was present at other performances in the same place, *Dido* (a school-drama in Latin hexameters, with no chorus, by J. Ritwyse, master of Paul's, and performed in earlier days by his 'children' before Wolsey), and N. Udall's *Ezechias* in English. A Latin version of the *Ajax flagellifer* of Sophocles had been prepared, but the Queen was too weary to hear it. In 1566, J. Still's *Gammer Gurtons Needle* was acted at Christ's College, and in 1567—9 there were plays in Jesus' College chapel. A stage was erected in Peterhouse for the comedy in 1571—2. In 1575 interludes and shows were forbidden. Another comedy at Jesus College at Christmas 1577, this time in the hall. About this time Sir J. Harington was at Cambridge, where 'the wyser sort did (and still doe, 1592) mayntayn' comedies and tragedies. In 1580 the Vice-Chancellor declines, on account of the plague, to accept Burleigh's offer to send the Earl of Oxford's players. In 1586 J. Smith (Chr.), founder of the General Baptists, preached in the University Church against the custom of acting plays on Saturday and Sunday evenings. He was called to order by A. Perne (Pot.) deputy V.C. In 1586—7, *Richard III.*, by Legge, was performed at Trinity. In 1590, W. Alabaster's tragedy *Rozana*, and *Pedantius*, a Latin broad farce (ascribed to either Mat. Wingfield or Beard) also at Trinity. *Lelia* at Queens' (again, according to Cooper, in 1596). In 1592 the University had a struggle with various companies of players, but the Queen gave notice for the students to prepare an English play. John Still (author of *Gammer Gurtons Needle*) as Vice-Chancellor begged for time, and to substitute *Latin*. In 1595 two comedies and a tragedy at Trinity; and a comedy at

King's. In 1596—7, *Hispanus*, and *Silvanus* a Latin comedy.

In 1597, D. Wilburne's *Machiavellus*, the author a Johnian. *Club Law*, an English comedy, in ridicule of the townsmen (? by G. Ruggle), at Clare. In 1600, a Corpus B.A. was suspended for taking part in an interlude at the Black Bear. And so we come to the *Pilgrimage to Parnassus* and the two parts of the *Return from Parnassus*, three comedies performed in St. John's College, Cambridge, 1597—1601 (very recently edited by Mr. Macray for the Clarendon Press), and to the confines of the Jacobean (*Ignoramus*) era, which does not fall within the limits of Mr. Herford's interesting and valuable work.

CHR. WORDSWORTH.

Les études classiques avant la Révolution par l'Abbé AUGUSTIN SICARD, vicaire de Saint-Philippe-du-Roule. Paris, libr. acad. Didier; Perrin & Cie, 1887. pp. ix. 590. 3 fr. 50.

THE Abbé Sicard, who has written another work on Education before and after the Revolution, has in the pages now under our notice given a sketch which we may commend both to those who have taken interest in the more serious issues of the *Battle of the Books*, and to those who may still be engaged in prosecuting or in pacifying the struggle in which Ancient is yet contending with Modern in the British Isles. As long ago as 1704 the Jesuits acting *Joseph vendu* before royalty, introduced Apollo in the prologue as mediating between the Genius of Latin and the Genius of French, and counselling them to be good neighbours.

The volume before me contains thirty chapters, whereof about one dozen relate directly to the fortunes of Latin and Greek as employed in education. The other chapters tell of the study of modern languages, history, geography, mathematics, utilitarian (or applied) sciences; of the cultivation of the memory and the judgement; of object-lessons, gymnastics and accomplishments.

In the latter portion of the book the author introduces us to the *systems* of the University of Paris, of the Jesuits, of the 'secular' colleges (of which nearly 400 grew up under episcopal supervision after the Suppression) of the Oratoire, and of the Military Schools established in Paris, and by the Benedictines. The last-named order at least before 1764 had established a 'modern side' for those pupils who were specially destined *au service*. Here and there M. Sicard inserts a programme (e.g. p. 452, of the Benedictines at Sorèze in 1775, where, by the way, they were so audacious as to abolish verse composition). Also, after the concluding chapters which relate to the state of education in 1789, he gives in an appendix the lists of authors read according to the four great systems. The author writes in a good-humoured style, and shows how the Church of France after the Renaissance was not so far behind-hand in the performance of her duty towards secondary—or even primary—education as some have reported.

I append a list of classical authors which I have extracted and combined from the four programmes to which I have alluded, namely, the course of study of the Jesuits (marked 'J'), Oratoire ('O'), Port-Royalists ('R') and University of Paris ('U') before the Revolution.

I. Authors included in the four schemes: Caesar, Cicero (Letters and other works), Q. Curtius, Horace, Nepos, Ovid, Phaedrus, Sallust, Vergil; Aesop, Demosthenes, Homer, Isokrates, Lucian and Plutarch, *J.O.R.U.*

II. Books which occur in three out of four programmes: Chrysostom, *J.O.U.*; Livy, *J.R.U.*; Justin and Juvenal, *O.R.U.*; Quintilian, *J.R.U.**

III. Books included in one or two of the four schemes: Epistolae et Evangelia de tempore, &c., *U.*; Aldus Manutius, *O.*; Aphthonius (Latin), *O.* From this author was derived the system of 'chries' (developed common-places, which were much used cir. 1620. See *xpeia* i. 4 in L. and S. Lexicon); Augustae Historiae Scriptores, *O.*; Aurelius Victor, *U.*; Catonis disticha, *O.*; Catullus, *J.*; Comenii Janua Linguarum, *O.*; Corderius, *O.*; Erasmus, *O.*; Eutropius, *R.*; Florus, *O.R.*; Jerome, *U.*; Laberii mini, *R.*; Lactantius, *U.*; Lipsii Monita Politica, *O.*; Martial, *O.*; Vell. Patereulus, *O.U.*; Persius, *O.U.*; Pliny (N.H.) *R.*; Pliny (Paneg.), *R.*; Pontanus, *O.*; Propertius, *J.*; Salvanus, *U.*; Seneca (Trag.) *O.*; Seneca (Philos.), *R.*; Statius, *O.*; Suetonius, *R.*; Tacitus, *R.U.*; Terence, *O.R.*; Tibullus, *J.O.*; Valerius Max., *O.*; Verini 'Vivere diverso,' *O.*

S. Lucae Evang., *R.U.*; Act. Apost., *O.*; Aelian, *R.*; Aeschines, *O.*; Aristotle (Rhet.), *R.U.**; Basil, *J.U.*; Cebetis tabula, *J.*; Cyprian, *U.*; Diodorus Siculus, *O.*; Dionys. Halicarn., *U.**; Euripides, *O.R.*; Gregor. Nazian., *J.U.*; Herodian, *R.* (tr. Politian); Herodotus, *R.U.*; Hesiod, *J.O.*; Longinus, *U.**; Pindar, *J.O.*; Phokylides, *J.*; Plato, *J.*; Sophokles, *O.R.*; Synesius, *J.*; Theognis, *J.O.*; Theokritos, *O.*; Thukydides, *J.R.*; Xenophon, *O.R.*

Some of these authors were read only in books of Selections, and all of course were expurgated where necessary. Aristophanes and Plautus seem to have been entirely proscribed. Was Aeschylus considered too difficult? The absence of all the works of the once dominant Aristotle (the Rhetoric excepted) is most interesting to notice.

That system of reading the classics which is connected in England with the name of Mr. Bohn was encouraged by the Port-Royalists in the seventeenth century. The Military Colleges about 1750 stereotyped the use of interlinear versions which Locke and others had recommended in a previous age.

CHR. WORDSWORTH.

Briefwechsel des Beatus Rhenanus. Gesammelt und herausgegeben von DR. ADALBERT HORAWITZ und DR. KARL HARTFELDER. Leipzig. (Teubner.) 1886. 8°. 28 Mk.

THE correspondence embraces the years 1506 (24 September) to 1546 (12 October). Most of the letters (which are all in Latin) appear here for the first time, but the volume includes also the Dedicatory Epistles written by Rhenanus for various works published during his time. Among the writers and those to whom Rhenanus wrote we find: Joh. Reuchlin, Joh. Oecolampadius, Konrad Peutinger, Willibald Pirckheimer, Desiderius Erasmus, Bonifacius Amerbach, Martin Bucer, Ulrich Zwingli, Ulrich von Hutten, Johannes Aventinus, Wolfgang Lazius, Joh. Oporinus, Sebastian Brant, Joh. à Lasco, &c., &c. The editors have also collected Rhenanus' poems; the epitaphs and inscriptions written by him at various times on various persons and events, and also the epigrams and verses written on him by various scholars. For the history, biography, bibliography, &c. of the period the volume is invaluable, and its value is increased by the editors' short but appropriate notes.—J. H.

* The books marked with an asterisk were recommended to the masters at Paris, along with the Psalter 'the unrivalled manual of rhetoric.'

Dom Thierry Ruinart (1657—1709). Notice suivie de Documents Inédits sur sa Famille, sa Vie, ses Oeuvres, ses Relations avec D. Mabillon, par HENRI JADART, Secrétaire Général de l'Académie de Reims. Paris, H. Champion. Reims, F. Michaud, 1886. 8vo. pp. viii 190, with engraving of the church of Hautvilliers, with Ruinart's tomb. 5 fr.

THE author is at home in his subject, having published *D. Jean Mabillon. Étude suivie de Documents Inédits sur sa Vie, ses Oeuvres, sa Mémoire* (Reims, 1879), and three other works on Mabillon, and also *L'Abaye d'Hautvilliers (Marne), ses Sépultures, la Tombe de D. Ruinart* (Caen, 1886). He hopes that the entire correspondence of his illustrious townsman may be given to the world; sixty letters written by, or

relating to, Ruinart or his teacher Mabillon, are here printed for the first time. Few literary friendships have been so close or so fruitful in results as that of the great and self-denying scholar, and the pupil who survived his loss but two years, after labouring with redoubled effort to leave none of their joint publications unfinished. Well may M. Jadart hold them up for imitation to their Church at this day (p. 10) :—

'Il nous semble que l'on ne peut trop louer cette noble et franche piété, vraie fille de l'Evangile, au contact de laquelle notre siècle devait se retremper. Aussi, dans les ouvrages de D. Ruinart, pas plus que dans sa conduite, on ne rencontre ni manifestation bruyante, ni crédulité puérile, ni défi hantant à ses adversaires.'

J. E. B. M.

EXPERIMENTS IN ARCHAIC METRE.

1. Θρηνοδία.

(Ἀχιλλεύς πρὸς Πάτροκλον.)

Χαῖρ', ὦ Δαναοῖσιν ἄσασι
τετιμένε κἀν Αἴδαο·
πάντες δ', ἄνα, θρηνέουσι
μάλ' οἰκτρὰ σέ, τὸν ποθεινόν.
ἦ γὰρ φάος ἦσθα φίλοισι·
πρῶτην δ' ὅς ἐλαμπες ἀστὴρ
ἠοῖος, ἔθ' Ἔσπερος ἔμπης
λάμπεις σὺ γε κἀν φθιμένοισι.
σοὶ δάκρυα δυοδάκρυτα

δοροῖμεθ', ὅμῃ δὲ καλῶσει
νῶϊν σορὸς ὅστέα, τέκνον.

2. Κερκίς.

Κερκίς ἴθ' ὦ κερκίς ἐμῇ,
ἔρδ', ὦ μάλα ποικιλόμῃτη,
κερκίς τρέχε, δῶρον Ἀθήνη,
κεδναῖσι μέλημα γυναιξίν.
αἰστέ μοι, αἰγείροιο
φύλλοις ἱκέλη στροβέονσα.

G. C. WARR.

NOTES.

TWO NOTES ON JULIUS CAESAR.

I. THE BRIDGE OVER THE RHINE.—Much the fullest discussion of the structure of this bridge that I have seen in the numerous English editions of Caesar that have lately appeared is given in Mr. Peskett's notes. By the aid of these and the accompanying illustrations we can follow Caesar's account without difficulty so far as the erection of two pairs of piles, sloping in opposite directions: and it seems probable that the two piles of each pair were connected by a cross-piece (Fig. i. c) which may be alluded to by the word *junctura*. But in the interpretation of the next sentence I venture to think that Mr. Peskett has chosen wrongly to follow the majority of commentators, and that only some translation similar to that given by Napoleon III. in his *Jules César* (bk. iii. cap. 7. § 3) can satisfy all requirements.

The passage is as follows (*B. G.* iv. 17).

'Haec utraque insuper bipedalibus trabibus immissis, quantum eorum tignorum junctura distabat, binis utrimque fibulis ab extrema parte distinebantur: quibus disclusis atque in contrariam partem revinctis tanta erat operis firmitudo atque ea rerum natura, ut quo maior vis aquae se incitavisset, hoc artius illigata tenerentur.'

The usual interpretation can easily be gathered from Mr. Peskett's notes: '*haec utraque*' is understood to mean 'in each case the two piles,' and the *fibulae* are arranged variously, but always as connecting two

neighbouring piles: and the words '*quibus disclusis*, etc.' are taken to refer to the *fibulae*, but are not exactly explained. But this totally fails to show how the security of the bridge was attained: on the contrary, the linking of the two adjoining piles only would leave the whole structure most unsteady. Caesar obviously speaks with some pride of an ingenious device to avoid this.

Napoleon's note is: 'It has not been hitherto observed that the words '*haec utraque*' relate to the two couples of one row of piles, and not to the two piles of one couple. Moreover the words '*quibus disclusis*, etc.' relate to these same two couples, and not, as has been supposed, to the *fibulis*.'

He gives a diagram in illustration, which is reproduced by Mr. Peskett, and which, as will be seen, represents a real addition to the strength and compactness of the bridge. It may further be noticed that the word '*distinebantur*' shows that the main object of the *fibulae* was to prevent the couples of piles from falling together inwards: and this end would most simply be attained by notching the *fibulae* or by letting them in to the beams at each end. The sentence will run more smoothly if we take the single word *quibus* to be *abl. instr.* and to refer to the *fibulae*: 'and the two couples of piles were kept open by these.' I do not feel quite satisfied with taking '*in contrariam partem revinctis*' to mean 'they were linked from one end of the bridge to the other:' may it not be 'they were linked together

Mr. D. NUTT, 270 Strand, London, W.C.

Please enter my name as a subscriber to

*Merguet's Lexicon zu den philosoph. Schriften Cicero's
appearing monthly at 2/. net each, and forward me the parts
as they come out.*

Name

Address

.....

Date

Merguet's *Lexicon Ciceronianum*.

Merguet's *Lexicon to the Speeches of Cicero* (4 volumes 4^{to}. £ 9.10.) is a work of recognised merit and authority which it would be superfluous to praise. All students of Latin will be glad to hear that the author is engaged upon a companion work dealing with the philosophical writings.

The *Lexicon zu den philosophischen Schriften Cicero's mit Angabe sämtlicher Stellen* will be on precisely the same lines and of the same scope as the author's previous work. It will be issued in about 60 parts, appearing monthly, costing 2/. net each. Müller's text in the Teubner series has been taken as basis, but the readings of Baiter and Halm, of Baiter's text edition in the Tauchnitz series, as well as the MS. variants will be embodied.

Intending subscribers are kindly requested to detach and return the annexed order form.

D. Nutt,

**Foreign and Classical Bookseller,
270 Strand, London.**

November 1887.

crosswise,' that is, the right-hand upper pile to the left-hand lower pile, and *vice versa*? This would avoid the difficulty of the two *fibulae* crossing halfway, so obvious in Napoleon's diagram.

If the *fibulae* were let into holes in the beams at each end, the force of the current, being somewhat greater upon the upper piles, and being counteracted at the lower piles by the special supports, would really be to force the upper piles against the *fibulae*, and the lower ends of the *fibulae* deeper into the lower piles: and thus, *prima facie* at least, to make the whole structure more compact. My attention has however been called to the fact that the bridge would still lack joints connecting the couples in the direction across the stream.

I propose therefore to translate the whole sentence as follows: 'connecting the two pairs of piles were laid beams of two feet width, that being the breadth of the joint between the two piles of each pair. The two pairs of piles were kept at their proper distance by two braces at their extremities on each side: and as these braces not only held them thus open, but also connected them cross-wise, the whole work was exceedingly firm, and by the effect of natural laws, the greater the stream of water that bore upon the whole, the more compact became its structure.'

II. CAESAR'S SPEECH IN BEHALF OF THE CATILINARIANS.—It seems to be generally supposed that Caesar, when pleading for a lighter penalty than that of death in the case of Lentulus and his associates, made a deliberate attack upon the state religion, and denied the accepted dogma of future punishments. Mr. Froude, in particular, in his 'Sketch' emphasizes this point. But if Caesar, appearing as *pontifex maximus* and praetor elect, and in a trial in which not only the life of other Roman citizens but his own also was threatened, gave his opponents any such advantage, we shall certainly have cause to wonder at his audacity rather than at his discretion. But this view is perhaps a little exaggerated.

It will be well in the first instance to quote the words of Sallust (Cat. 51. 20) 'De poena possum equidem dicere, id quod res habet, in luctu atque miseriis mortem aeternarum requiem, non cruciatum esse; eam cuncta mortalium mala dissolvere, ultra neque curae neque gaudii locum esse.' With the exception of the last clause, there is no reference to a future state of rewards or punishment: a question quite distinct is proposed, whether death in itself is a good or an evil.

The reference in Cicero's speech (Cat. iv. 7) is more explicit. 'Alter (C. Caesar) intelligit mortem a dis immortalibus non esse supplicii causa constitutam, sed aut necessitatem naturae aut laborum ac miseriarum quietem esse: itaque eam sapientes nunquam inviti, fortes etiam saepe libenter oppetiverunt.' This is a better authority for us to follow than Sallust's statement, which may very well be taken from it: and Caesar's meaning clearly is that death is in itself a blessing. It is possible he may have hinted his disbelief in any life beyond: Cicero in his reply certainly urges that the old Romans had determined there must be some kind of punishment in the world below like those which Caesar is proposing for Catiline and his associates now: or else ill-doers would have no reason to dread death. But even if Cicero bases his counter-argument on a religious dogma, it does not follow that Caesar had gone out of his way to attack it.

That the question whether death in itself is an evil was a *κοινὸς τόπος* of the schools, appears from Juvenal x. 357-9,

'fortem posce animum, mortis terrore carentem,
qui spatium vitae extremum inter munera ponat
naturae,'

and abundant illustration is given in Prof. Mayor's¹ note on this passage. But it is characteristic of Roman forensic oratory that so abstract a discussion should form a prominent feature in an exciting political debate: and if Caesar compromised himself in any way during its course, it was probably because he imagined himself for the moment with his old teacher at Rhodes, and in the enjoyment of the full freedom of academic debate. That any disrespect was intended to the religion of his ancestors is most unlikely: for that Caesar was quite as ready as Cicero himself to support as a statesman, though it might have but little influence on his speculative views.

E. V. ARNOLD.

THE EPITHET GIVEN TO PROCHYTA BY VERGIL IN AEN. IX. 715.—At the beginning of the seventh volume (1849) of *The Classical Museum*, there is an article 'On Critical Induction,' by 'C. B.' It contains (p. 4) the following:—

'Tum sonitu Prochyta alta tremit, durumque cubile
Inarime Jovis imperiis imposta Typhoeo.'

Whatever may be the exact height of Prochyta, the epithet *alta* is absurd when mention is made in the same sentence of Inarime (*Ischia*), which is close by it, and one of the highest mountains in the country. All that can be said is that *alta* is a kind of hack epithet with Vergil, and especially with the elision, as here used.

The writer then quotes the following passages:—*Aen.* ix. 678; *Georg.* ii. 479; *Aen.* x. 197: i. 189; iv. 343; vi. 179; ix. 388; *Georg.* iii. 393; *Aen.* vi. 788; i. 427, 429; xii. 929; ii. 448; xii. 546, 547, 474. In none of these passages do I see any ground for finding fault with the epithet *alta*, nor do I think that the elision affects the epithet at all.

Forbiger refers to his note on *Aen.* iii. 76. He there says:—

'Verissime docet Wagner insulas (utpote quae omnes mari eminent) poetis promiscue altis dici, ut ab ipso Virgilio, ix. 715, Prochyta, quae humilis fuerit.'

Conington says:—

'Prochyta may be called *alta* as a rocky island, or *alta* may go with *tremit*, which seems more likely.'

I would rather account for the epithet thus:—Vergil had I think in his eye that lofty rock in the north-east of Procida (*Prochyta*), on which is now the Castello. In a foreshortened view of the island from the mainland, such as was familiar to Vergil, it would be the prominent object, and would seem quite to justify the epithet *alta*.—J. HOSKYNs ABRAHAM.

Immunis aram si tetigit manus
Non sumptuosâ blandior hostiâ,
Mollivit aversos penates
Farre pio et saliente mica.

This clear passage has been darkened by the multitude of commentators. Remove the comma after *manus* and place it after *hostiâ*. *Immunis* is as elsewhere in Horace 'without a gift' and emphatic. Construe:

'If without a gift thy hand has touched the altar not (seeking to become) more coaxing by (the sacrifice of) a costly victim, then it has appeased the angry Penates with the simple *mola salsa*.'

The force of the comparative *blandior* is thus exactly given; the suppliant approaches the altar without a gift, not endeavouring to *add* to her powers of persuasion by a costly sacrifice, and *blandus* is used with some scorn (cf. *blandiri*), Horace distinctly

¹ Prof. Mayor now takes *extremum* as predicate, in edition of 1886, vol. I. p. 466.

deprecating such endeavours to 'wheedle' the gods into showing favour, cf. his scornful use of *pacisci* 'to bargain'—*rotis pacisci, ne Cypriac Tyriaeque merces dē*.

The stanza probably represents a well known γνῶμη, cf. Pliny *Præf. N. H.* *mola tantum salsa titant qui non habent tura*. The *mola salsa* is not reckoned as a 'gift' but represents the spirit of sacrifice and avails without any costly sacrifice.—T. E. P.

EMENDATION OF LIVY XLII. 17, AND OF APPIAN, *Maced.* XI. 7, 8.—When the Romans were hunting up pretexts for the third Macedonian war, it was asserted, among other things, that Perseus had bribed a wealthy citizen of Brundisium to poison certain leading Romans and envoys as they passed through that town on their way to and from the East, or (as Appian says) to poison the senate. This citizen had been selected by Perseus owing to the special facilities he enjoyed for perpetrating the crime. *Princeps Brundisii Rammius fuit: hospitio quoque et duces Romanos omnes et legatos exterarum quoque gentium insignes, praecepit regis, accipiebat*.

Summoned to Perseus' court, Rammius, in terror of being himself a victim, promised to carry out the plot, but instead of returning home hastened to C. Valerius, at that time at Chalcis, who sent him on to Rome. There he laid his information before the senate.

The name of this Brundisium is given by Livy as L. Rammius, by Appian as Herennios. The latter is more probable, as the name Rammius seems not to occur elsewhere, though Remmius, Rennius, Ramnius, and other similar names appear on inscriptions and coins. But an inscription discovered by Carapanos at Dodona in 1876 (Cauer², No. 247; Collitz, *Samm-lung*, vol. ii. heft 1), and discussed among others by Fick, *Bezenberger's Beiträge*, iii. p. 269; Bursian, *Sitzungsberichte d. Bayer. Königl. Acad.* 1878, ii. p. 15, and by Mr. Roberts, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, ii. p. 113, seems to throw doubt upon either name being the correct form. That inscription contains a grant by the Epirotes of *prozenia*, and other privileges, to one Gaios Dazoupos Rennios, of Brundisium, on the ground of the 'goodwill which he continues to bear towards the Epirotes.'

Fick assigned this inscription to later than 244 B.C. when Brundisium became a Roman colony, since Rennios had three names after the Roman fashion. By the reference in the decree to Antinous as strategos of the Epirotes, compared with Polybius xxvii. 13, 7, xxx. 7, 2, and Livy xlv. 26, Bursian fixed the date more closely as about 170 B.C. Now as Rammius was in Macedonia in 172, is it unreasonable to suppose that he had visited his friends in Epirus too, and was honoured by this decree in his favour? It is extremely improbable that there should be two persons living in Brundisium at the same time, with names so similar, and both distinguished for hospitality to foreigners; there need, therefore, be no hesitation in replacing the Rammius of Livy, the Herennios of Appian by the Gaios Dazoupos Rennios of the Dodonaean Inscription.—P. GILES.

THE ASTRAGALIZONTES OF POLYCLETUS.—In the excursus upon the Social Games of Rome, in *Gallus*, Becker mentions the Greek game of ἀστράγμοις, 'odd and even,' known at Rome as *par impar*, and after describing it, adds 'The *Astragalizontes* of Polycletus may however have been real dice-players.' Certainly 'may have been,' but from the comparison of a passage in Apoll. Rhod. and from general considerations it seems much more probable that it represented boys playing at ἀστράγμοις.

From the words of Pliny (N. H. xxxiv. § 19) we only

gather that this famous work represented boys playing with ἀστράγμοι (knucklebones), and we know that besides the use of knucklebones (or imitation ones) as dice, called by Becker (*Charicles* p. 354) 'the regular game,' and the game of ἀστράγμοις, there were other games played with ἀστράγμοι, as for instance πεντάλιθα. The passage I refer to is Ap. Rh. iii. 117 foll.: where Eros and Ganymede are playing together.

ἀμφ' ἀστράγμοις δὲ τῶγε
χρυσέοις, ἅτε κούροι δμήθεες, ἐψιδῶντο.
καὶ β' ὁ μὲν ἦδη πάνπαν ἐνίπλεον φ' ὑπὸ μαζῇ
μάργος Ἔρως λαΐης ὑποίσχανε χειρὸς ἀροστόν,
ὀρθὸς ἐφεστῆας . . . ὁ δ' ἐγγύθεν ὀκλαδὴν ἦστο
σίγα κατηφιόων· δοῖα δ' ἔχεν, ἄλλον ἔτ' αὖτως
ἄλλω ἐπιπρῶϊσι· κεχόλωτο δὲ καγχαλῶντι,
καὶ μὴν τούσγε παράσσον ἐπὶ προτέρῳισιν ὀλέσσας
κ. τ. λ.

There are three points in which the game here described resembles ἀστράγμοις. (1) It was especially a child's game. See Becker's *Charicles*, p. 354, where he alludes to antiques representing children at this game, and wherever it is mentioned it is mostly spoken of as played by children or by men who make themselves children, see Plat. *Lysis* 206 E.; Ar. *Rhet.* iii. 5. 4 (where Cope shortly describes the game in his note); Lucian. *Dial. Deor.* IV.; so with *par impar*, see Hor. *Sat.* ii. 3. 248; Suet. *Aug.* 71. Eros is always represented as preeminently childish in appearance and habits, to make the more piquant his mischievous disposition and enormous power for evil. (2) The game in Apollonius is played not only with golden knucklebones but for them, because Ganymede loses all he has. (3) The attitude of Eros is just what might be expected. He holds his hands upon his breast, asking Ganymede to guess, and Becker himself in the passage from *Gallus* quoted says in allusion to ἀστράγμοις, 'it is represented in works of art, as for instance where a boy is pressing the hand containing his gains to his breast.' I may add that Becq de Fouquières in his *Joux des Anciens* (pp. 284-289) refers at some length to this passage of Apollonius and takes it for granted that ἀστράγμοις is here represented. The only difficulty is the word ἐπιπρῶϊσι 'throwing forward,' which would naturally refer to dice. But may it not mean merely 'staking,' as Becq de Fouquières translates 'il n'avait plus que deux osselets qu'il aventurait l'un après l'autre'? However it is clear from e.g. Plat. *Alc.* 2 and from engravings of ancient frescoes given by Becq de Fouquières on pp. 332, 333 that boys played games with ἀστράγμοι in which they threw them forward as dice are thrown. Still this by no means outweighs the reasons above given for thinking ἀστράγμοις is represented in Apoll. Rhod., and assuming that, is it rash to suppose that Apollonius has in mind the very statue of Polycletus referred to by Pliny, for most people will agree that he is representing some work of art—painting or sculpture? At all events I think it will be admitted that the game of 'odd and even' suits the conditions of the statue of Polycletus, if not better than any other game with ἀστράγμοι, certainly far better than the game with dice.

R. C. SEATON.

ANNOUNCEMENTS.—Editions of Polybius and of Apollonius Rhodius are in preparation, the former by Mr. J. L. Strachan Davidson of Balliol College, the latter by Mr. R. C. Seaton, late Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. A series of parallel grammars will shortly be commenced under the supervision of Mr. E. A. Sonnenschein, professor of Greek and Latin at Mason College, Birmingham, who will himself contribute the Latin grammar. It is hoped by the

employment of a uniform terminology to avoid the confusion now arising from the use of different terms to express the same or corresponding facts in different languages.

Mr. Teubner announces in his *Mitteilungen* for 1887 (1) A *Corpus glossariorum Latinorum*, edited by G. Goetz who acknowledges his obligations to G. Löwe, Gundermann, and other scholars. The first volume will contain a history of Latin glossography; the second, which is already in type, contains Philo-

xenus and the pseudo-Cyriel. There will probably be nine volumes in all; (2) *Pergamos* by E. Thraemer, an inquiry into the early history and legends of the western side of Asia Minor; (3) an unpublished treatise of Plutarch on the Proverbs of Alexandria, edited by O. Crusius; (4) a new edition of K. F. Hermann's *Plato*, by Th. Wohlrab, with an accompanying volume on the 147 MSS. of *Plato*. As regards the mutual relations of the MSS., Wohlrab is in substantial agreement with Schanz.

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

OXFORD.

Congregation has accepted the preambles of two statutes, the first affirming the principle that a School of Modern Language and Literature should be started; the second leading to some change in the practice of the Bodleian curators with regard to lending books. The Modern Language and Literature proposal gets into committee first, and there are two classes of amendments—one aiming at the insertion of various less known—especially Slavonic—languages, the other attempting to secure the recognition of literature; as the present proposals throw the whole management of the School into the hands of the philologists. It is a tribute to the humanising influence of Latin and Greek studies, that the Professors of those languages are the champions whom the advocates of culture wish to place on the board. Meanwhile something better is to be done. The Merton Professorship is to be limited to language, as it practically was already; and the Chair of Poetry is to be widened into a Chair of English Literature. But all these projects are only in their first stage, and the term will only just suffice to settle them. The only thing certain is that the philologists will have it all their own way, unless the less constant attendants come down and vote. The Bodleian

question is likely to be fiercely contested: but the preliminary discussion was calming. The 'borrowers' list' was read, and the Librarian gave explanations which tended to prove that very little harm had as yet been done by the assailed officials. At the same time, it seems that readers do sometimes go away because the books they wanted are lent out. The general tendency of the discussion, as well as the obvious feeling of the audience, was in favour of very strict rules: but it was pointed out that some of the collections had been left under condition that they should be lent to certain classes of claimants.

Dr. Tylor continues his exposition of the Pitt-Rivers collection. He is dealing at present with the development of armour: and pointed out, amongst other things, that the shield was originally an offensive weapon—a parrying-stick—used defensively, and was gradually modified so as to cover more and more of the person. One curiosity shown was a very good representative of a Greek helmet from the South Sea islands: but it was not impossible the result of early intercourse with Spaniards, and not a home-growth.

The Rev. W. W. Jackson has been elected Rector of Exeter College.

CAMBRIDGE.

Mr. E. A. Gardner (*Cuius*) has been elected to the Craven Studentship. This is the first election to the studentship, which was established in 1885 for the encouragement of advanced study or research away from Cambridge. Mr. Gardner is well known for the active part he has taken in the exploration of Naucratis and for other archaeological work in Egypt in conjunction with Mr. Flinders Petrie.

The financial needs of the library are once more

brought up in a report of the Syndicate. Unless research is to be crippled in various departments, £1,000 of additional income must be provided.

By the sudden death of the Hon. I. G. N. Keith-Falconer at Aden the university has lost an Arabic scholar of great promise. He succeeded Mr. Robertson Smith as Lord Almoner's reader in Arabic only last year.

We have received the following from our Dublin correspondent:—

I find that in my May letter I have fallen into an inexcusable mistake. Dr. Edward Hincks was neither an astronomer nor, strictly speaking, a classical archaeologist. He was an Egyptologist and Assyriologist, and one of the greatest discoverers in those

departments of investigation. One correspondent tells me: 'Outside the domain of mathematics the greatest name of this century on the roll of Dublin University is that of Edward Hincks.' Another says: 'No other man ever did so much for any other language as Hincks for Assyrian.'

[For Scholarships see page 183.]

ARCHAEOLOGY.

Historia Numorum: a Manual of Greek Numismatics. By BARCLAY V. HEAD, Assistant-Keeper of the Department of Coins and Medals in the British Museum. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1887.

MR. HEAD'S *Historia Numorum* is the most comprehensive work on numismatic science NOS. V. & VI. VOL. I.

that has appeared since Eckhel's days. It represents a masterly, if perhaps too heroic, endeavour to compress within the limits of a portly octavo volume a general outline of the almost inexhaustible coinages of the Hellenic world. I have said 'Hellenic,' but the subject is of so vast a nature as to require a notice of whole categories of coins

—Lycian, Indian, Punic, Iberian, and others, the history of which is inseparable from those of more purely Greek fabric. In all this Mr. Head has shrunk from no obstacle of character or language, and the last results of exploration in these special fields will be found duly summarised in his work.

Mr. Head's work is not a series of essays like Lenormant's unfinished *Histoire de la Monnaie dans l'Antiquité*. It does not profess to be a complete and detailed description of every known type like that of Mionnet. Neither does it pretend to be a modern substitute for the *Doctrina Numorum*. The great work of Eckhel will still remain the starting-point of numismatic science. But, as Mr. Head very justly reminds us, that science has undergone an entirely new development since Eckhel's days. Fresh fields of study, of which the author of the *Doctrina* was ignorant, have been opened up. New alphabets and syllabaries have been discovered and deciphered. Hoard after hoard of ancient coins has been brought to light presenting endless new varieties. Wrong attributions, such as those that deprive Elis and Corinth of their coinages, have been set right. Whole classes previously unknown have been recognised and tabulated. Of the electrum staters of Cyzicus, the very existence of which had been doubted by Eckhel, no less than 150 varieties have now been described. More than this, new principles and methods have been introduced into the study of ancient coins by the advance of metrology, epigraphy, and the archaeology of art. The weight, the form of the letters, and the style of the design at present afford criteria as to the date of a coin such as were almost wholly wanting at the beginning of this century.

With the difficult subject of metrology Mr. Head shows himself specially competent to deal. In his interesting and comprehensive introduction the vexed questions connected with the origin and transmission of weight-standards receive fresh and suggestive treatment based on the most recent discoveries and investigations. On the one side stands the Egyptian decimal system with its *kats* and *utens*, upon which Mr. Petrie's researches have shed so much new light. On the other is the Babylonian and Assyrian sexagesimal system, derived apparently from time-measures based on the astronomic science of old Chaldaea. Mr. Head, while acknowledging the possible influence of the Egyptian standard on some early coins of Lycia and Thrace for example, accepts the

claims put forward on behalf of Babylonia and Assyria as the sources of all Greek metric systems. The ancient duck and lion weights of Assyria show us a heavy and light mina for the respective weight of which Brandis' estimate of 1010 and 505 grammes may still be regarded as approximately accurate. Of these the heavier seems to have been more generally in use in Syria, whence it passed to the Phoenicians, who, however, while adopting the heavy *shekel*, its sixtieth part, as their unit of weight, rejected the sexagesimal system in favour of a mina of fifty shekels, only retaining the old system in the talent of sixty minae. The lighter mina, on the other hand, with its lighter shekel seems to have found favour among the Hittites, the natural intermediaries between Assyria and the western parts of Asia Minor. Mr. Head, indeed, advances some good reasons for supposing that the 'mina of Carchemish,' as the light Babylonian standard is described in cuneiform inscriptions, had reached the shores of the Troad at a period long anterior to the first issue of coined money. In the Trojan treasure discovered by Dr. Schliemann were six silver wedges, each apparently representing one-third of the light mina, a fact which it is difficult not to connect with the Hittite association, in which the men of Ilion, the Dardanians and their kin, appear in Egyptian records of the fourteenth century before our era. The 'weight of Carchemish' was adopted by the Lydians, and the bullet-like electrum pieces ascribed to Gyges (circ. B.C. 700), the earliest known coins, were thus regulated by the light Assyrian mina. From Lydia this lighter standard passed to Milêtos and other Ionian cities, and so on to Euboea, giving rise in turn to the Euboic system, to which Solon's legislation gave still wider currency as the Attic. On the other hand the heavier Assyrian standard spreading over sea from Phoenicia took root in Aegina and the Peloponnese, where Pheidôn of Argos, though not 'the inventor of money,' may at least be regarded as the author of the earliest coinage of Greece Proper—the archaic 'tortoises' of Aegina.

As a rule, in his geographical arrangement, Mr. Head follows the order generally adopted by numismatists, placing however Lydia and Phrygia immediately after Ionia and Caria. The vast preponderance of the coinage of Imperial date in the inland regions and a certain community of type, notably the frequent representations of the bust of the *IEPA CYNKAHTOC* personified,

afford good reasons for not breaking up the series pertaining to the senatorial province of Asia by the interpolation of coins from other Anatolian regions. It is a pity, however, that the author has not seen his way to throw over the preposterous and perverse arrangement by which Sybaris, for example, is included in 'Lucania,' or Caulonia in 'Bruttium.' Again, the separation of the coins of the two shores of the Cimmerian Bosphorus is wholly arbitrary, nor can the general practice of numismatists be pleaded against a violation of historic unity. But the arrangement as a whole leaves little to be desired, and Mr. Head has shown himself laudably anxious in fixing the site of ancient mint-towns to incorporate the results of the latest archaeological exploration. In the case of Phrygia he has had the valuable assistance of Professor Ramsay.

Few indeed are the numismatic students who would consider themselves competent to follow Mr. Head over the whole of the vast field that is covered by the present work. Specialists in this or that branch will here and there complain that coins by which they themselves set store have been left out in the cold. But in condensing such a huge mass of facts some omissions were inevitable. The whole is in this case so much greater than the part that it is not without a certain sense of captiousness that I venture to note a few suggestions and rectifications that occur to me on a first perusal of Mr. Head's book. In the case of Italy, as the author himself informs us, he had not the advantage of consulting Garrucci's work, *Le monete dell' Italia Antica*, otherwise he would have found, for instance, a confirmation of his conjecture that the remarkable male figure on the coins of Caulonia supporting on his outstretched arm a running mannikin with winged feet represents not Apollo Katharsios but a local subject. The inscription KOKIN... read by Garrucci over the head of the principal figure now shows conclusively that it is in fact a personification of the Cocinthian promontory who with the aid of Zephyr purges from its malarious exhalations the narrow valley (αἰλόν) in which the city lay. In his arduous endeavour to reduce to chronological order the complicated and very extensive series of Tarentine coins Mr. Head would have received no assistance from Garrucci's work, which in this respect is confusion worse confounded. The general result at which he arrives is corroborated by some large recent finds of Tarentine coins, but the complete break in the didrachm series which he sup-

poses to have occurred on the Roman conquest of B.C. 272 seems very doubtful, and the interesting type reading TAPANTI-ΝΩΝΗΜΙ (Ταπαρτίων ἐμὶ) must on grounds of style be taken from the fourth-century class with which Mr. Head groups it and referred to a date nearer the middle of the preceding century B.C. The silver type of Rubi, presenting on one side the full-faced head of Hēlios, is, as Avellino first pointed out in his essay *De argenteo Rubastino*, an alliance piece struck on the occasion of the Italian expedition of the Molossian Alexander, and is paralleled by types of that prince and the Tarentines. It thus belongs to a small class of coins which has a special chronological value and its date should have been approximately given as 332 B.C., a generation earlier than it appears in the *Manual*. At Heraclea the appearance of the name of the engraver, Aristoxenos, who also worked at Metapontion, should have been noted, and amongst the coins of the Bruttians the small bronze piece having as its obverse type the head of Athēnē with a helmet in the shape of a crab—a type which Lenormant has with great probability brought into relation with the Pallas cult of Skyllétion and its river *Karkinēs*—should hardly have been omitted.

To the few known coins of Hierōn's Aetna enumerated by Mr. Head may be added the type presenting the so-called 'crayfish' (better described as the Mediterranean prawn), on which Holm (*Das Alte Catania*, p. 7) lays stress as an additional link with the Catanese series. The enigmatic ΙΒ on the coins of Segesta and Eryx has not yet received its solution. The suggestions that it is the equivalent of the Phoenician 'Tsits,' and that 'Tsits' in turn = ὄρμος or Panormos, seem equally inadmissible. Ugdulena has shown that 'Tsits,' for which he prefers to read 'Tsejets,' for Σέγεσσ does not, as De Sauley supposed, occur on Panormitan coins. Nor can ΙΒ be fairly regarded as a Greek transliteration of this Phoenician word, since it occurs on coins of Segesta and Eryx in the variant forms ΙΙ, ΙΙΙ, ΙΙΑ, and ΙΙΕ. Eckhel's dictum still holds good: 'hos numeros inter ignotos ablegandos censeo quos aliquando felicior quidam Laii filius evolvat.'

To the Illyrian cities included in the *Manual* as having struck autonomous coins may be added Lissos—Alessio—(*Num. Chron.* 1880, p. 271) and Scupi—Üsküp—(Postolacca—*Synopsis*, &c.).

The early coins which Mr. Head in agreement with Imhoof-Blumer and Von Sallet attributes to Apollonia in Thrace must in all probability be referred to the Tauric Chersonese. The Russian numismatist Chr. Giel has proved almost to demonstration that in fact Pantikapæon itself, like its fellow colony on the western shores of the Euxine, took its original Hellenic name from Apollo, the state patron of its Milesian mother-city. The small fifth-century silver pieces with the legend ΑΠ or ΑΠΟΛ in the incuse square and with the lion's scalp are themselves only distinguishable by their slightly earlier fabric from the pieces of similar design which bear the legend ΠΑΝ or ΠΑΝΤΙ, and are the undoubted product of the Pantikapæan mint. The connexion is however rendered still more intimate by the occurrence of another closely allied class of coin with the legends ΑΠΟ, ΠΑ or ΠΑΝΤΙ, having on the obverse in place of the lion's scalp an ant, *μύρμηξ*, the *type parlant* of Myrmækion, a small town which might almost be regarded as a quarter of Pantikapæon. It is further to be remarked that these coins reading ΑΠ and ΑΠΟΛ are, so far as is at present known, only found at Kertch or in its district. During a short stay in that town, I was indeed so fortunate as to obtain what I cannot but regard as an additional numismatic record of the Tauric Apollonia. Together with one or two of the small Apollonian silver pieces with the lion's scalp I secured, also from the Pantikapæan site, a unique and hitherto unpublished Cyzicene stater of the finest style, on which the Hyperborean Apollo, olive-branch in hand, is seen mounted on his griffin. Lenormant has rightly laid stress on the federal character assumed by so many Cyzicene types. When we find the Sphinx of Chios or the winged boar of Klazomenae, the lion of Milêtos, the half Pegasos of Lampsakos and other national types linked together on these staters with the Cyzicene tunny, we are justified in supposing that 'a number of towns of Asia Minor and the Euxine shores seeing the enormous profits that Cyzicus drew from its monetary operations allied themselves with this town to exploit in common the Hyperborean gold and took shares, so to speak, in the great Cyzicene undertaking.' That Pantikapæon the channel through which the gold-hoards of the Ural reached the Cyzicene speculators should have itself obtained this monetary recognition was only to be expected, and accordingly, though at a

somewhat later date, we find the Pan's head of its coinage represented on Cyzicene staters. In the present instance I venture to see an eloquent allusion to the earlier name of the same city which identified it in a special way with the cult of the Hyperborean Apollo. Amongst the coins of the neighbouring Sindi, Mr. Head has omitted the important type, first described by Oreschuikoff, the reverse of which displays the owl of the Athenian decadrachms, a coin of considerable interest as a landmark of Athenian enterprise in this direction, and as affording a close parallel to the coins of similar type struck by Amisos opposite under its new name of Peiræus.

The language which Mr. Head habitually uses with regard to Greek autonomous coins of the imperial period seems liable to misconstruction. Certainly, in the case of Roman Colonies the right of coinage was due to special privilege on the part of the Emperor or the Governor of the Province. But unless we are to suppose that in every treaty of alliance between Rome and a Free City there was a special clause affecting the issue of coinage—an entirely gratuitous assumption—it must be admitted that in the case of these Free and Allied Cities the full right of coinage remained, though it was not always thought politic to make use of it. It was, as is well known, a maxim of Roman law, that such cities or peoples were outside the Roman jurisdiction. But this constitutional aspect has not been sufficiently regarded in the *Manual*. To take the extreme instance of Massalia, which does not seem to have struck coins after its capture by Caesar's legate, there can be little doubt that, had the city considered a resumption of its autonomous coinage compatible with its interests, it could have continued to strike coins. There was an excellent reason for the interruption of its coinage, for the treasury was cleared out by the invaders; but the independence of the Massaliote Commonwealth was not touched. Strabo expressly tells us that in his day Massalia was not subject to the Governor of the Province. The cessation of the Massaliote currency should be rather taken in connexion with the very small denominations of its pre-existing autonomous coinage, and the large use already prevailing of foreign money. The general custom of the West also told against the exercise of its undoubted right of coinage; but had Massalia lain in Asia, we may be very sure that its mint would not have remained inactive. To take another and more con-

spicuous instance, that of Athens. 'It is probable,' Mr. Head tells us, 'that about the time of Hadrian the rare privilege of striking autonomous bronze money was accorded to Athens.' It is possible that after Sulla's capture a break occurs in the autonomous currency. Political expediency may well have dictated such an omission, but the question of right was surely not touched. After Sulla's time, as before, Athens remained a Free City, and if while reviving its bronze coinage it still abstained from striking gold or silver, it never at least condescended, even in the sunniest hours of imperial favour, to place either Caesar's image or his circumscription on its χαλκοί. The constitutional position of many Greek cities as regards the Empire was of such a kind that even when, as is generally the case, we find the effigy of the reigning Emperor on their autonomous coins, its appearance should be rather regarded as a voluntary tribute of respect or adulation than as due to any legal obligation. The general cessation of autonomous coinages, outside Egypt, towards the end of the third century, a cessation which connects itself with the administrative reforms of Aurelian, cannot itself be taken as a proof that the Free Cities abdicated their privilege. A Free City would by the very nature of things be more anxious to gratify the wishes of the Emperor than one of inferior title to bow to his will. Thus at Cherson, to take an eminent example, although the usual break in the coinage seems to occur about the end of the fourth century of our era, the right of coinage was never relinquished. About Justinian's time we find the Tauric City, inspired perhaps by the Western examples of Ravenna and Ticinum, reissuing an autonomous coinage which with the complimentary adjuncts of imperial effigies and monograms continued to the eleventh century.

It is indeed in its treatment of the autonomous coinages belonging to the imperial period that Mr. Head's book leaves most to be desired. Yet from many points of view these coins have a greater value than those of a better artistic period. The aesthetic element which to many is the great attraction of Greek coins has, it is true, largely diminished. But the idealism of the great age brought with it a vagueness of type which in less skilled hands rapidly sank into vapidness. Types are etherealised till every characteristic feature has been improved away, and we know not who stands before us, a nymph or a goddess, a local hero or a pan-Hellenic god, nay, at times, we are even left

in doubt whether the form be human or divine. It is still a moot point, for instance, whether the head on the beautiful drachms of Lamia represents Apollo, as Dr. Friedlaender supposes, or, as Professor Gardner holds, the celebrated courtesan! In contradistinction to this the antiquarian and realistic spirit of the Greco-Roman period is peculiarly valuable. Even regarding them from the point of view of art, it is to the coins of this period alone that we can turn for any accurate representation of many of the masterpieces of ancient sculpture. The Didymean Apollo of Milêtos and the Aphroditê of Knidos, the Leto of Ephranor and Tychê of Eutychides, the Parthenos and Olympic Zeus of Phidias himself are only a few among the great plastic works of antiquity commemorated for us on this later series of autonomous coins. The constitution of individual cities, their geography and commerce, the architecture of their buildings, and the statues in their public places, the portraits of their worthies, the festivals of the citizens, and their special religious cults are illustrated as they were never illustrated before. The necessarily restricted currency of these civic as opposed to imperial issues gave the freest scope to local colouring.

It is evident that Mr. Head does not underrate this important part of his subject. In his comprehensive introduction he has given a useful list of the titles attached to the cities themselves, and to their varied magistracy and priesthood, as well as the names of their games and festivals. Nor has he omitted to give a fuller description of some at least of the more remarkable local types. But he seems to have been deterred by considerations of space from treating of this later period with a measure of fullness at all proportionate to the vast mass of material at his disposal. Thus, although he has evidently exercised great care in his selection of types for 'honourable mention,' the irresistible consequences of undue compression are none the less visible. Important types are omitted or referred to with a brevity incompatible with information. Inscriptions are given without the accompanying type, and types without the inscription. The illustrations of coins of this later period are reduced to a minimum. Yet there are many types of imperial times far more deserving of reproduction than not a few of the earlier coins of which illustrations are given in the book. What indeed could be of more graphic interest than such topographical designs as that for instance

of the Samaritan Neapolis exhibiting Mount Gerizim with its twin temple-crowned summits, or the better known companion piece of Athens that gives us a glimpse of the Akropolis and its buildings? What more interesting coin can be conceived than that of Pautalia, on which are allegorically grouped the Strymon and its navigation, the genii of vintage and harvest and the plodding gnomes of its mines weighed down with their gold and silver burdens? Again, even when the later types are of no special individual interest, they are often deserving of notice as monuments of civic continuity. The later coinages of that ΕΑΕΥΘΕΡΑ ΧΕΡ-CONHCOC to which reference has been already made are passed over for instance with a reference to the *Musée Kotschoubey*. Yet even as a signal example of the survival of free Hellenic life some further attention was due to a city whose autonomous coinage extends over fourteen centuries, and which, in the words of Finlay, 'though surrounded by powerful enemies and barbarous nations,' was still enabled to preserve

'A Homer's language murmuring in her streets
And in her havens many a mast from Tyre.'

It would perhaps be possible to issue a shorter 'Handbook' for educational purposes, but regarded as a 'History,' the present work would considerably gain by greater fullness. Not only do we need a fuller description of many of the types, but the introductory portion might be amplified with advantage. In its present form Mr. Head's *Historia Numorum* is a landmark of numismatic progress. But the subject is too vast for the space accorded to it. In conclusion I cannot do better than express a fervent hope that a second edition of the work may ere long see the light in two volumes and with twice the amount of illustrations.

ARTHUR J. EVANS.

Die Griechischen Vasen mit Meistersignaturen, von WILHELM KLEIN. Second edition; revised and enlarged. 8vo. Pp. xii. 261. Vienna: Carl Gerold's Sohn. 6 Mk.

KLEIN has now made the same advance in his *Meistersignaturen* that he made last year in his *Euphronios*. Ascertaining in the first what works of the Greek vase-painters are still extant, and discussing in detail in the second the extant works of one of the greatest of those painters, Klein some years ago placed the study of this branch of Greek art on new and firmer ground. But books like his, that are the first sure guides to neglected subjects, must always need large additions and some correction: and it is not till they reach a revised edition that their full effect is felt. He is now able to give 424 vases by 103 painters in place of 389 vases by 93 painters. But some minor corrections are still needed: for instance, two vases are said to be at Paris in the

Collection Rayet, which collection was dispersed by auction in the spring of 1879. It should be understood that the book is not by any means a mere catalogue. Many vases are signed by two painters, one with *εποίησεν* and the other with *εγραψεν*, or both with *εποίησεν*. On many vases with signatures there are also other names followed by *καλῶς* or *καλῇ*: and on some there are two or three names with these epithets. Working out the connections thus established, Klein has arranged the painters in a series of groups: and has fixed the sequence of these groups in date by certain broad differences of style. Minor differences of style mark many unsigned vases as the work of these painters: but Klein wisely avoids this point, seeing that it could not be treated convincingly without a mass of costly illustrations. Yet in truth style is often a safer guide than mere signatures. The story of Pheidias and Agoracritos shows that in Greece one artist sometimes signed another's work: and in the case of Duris, for example, one or two vases with his signature are not the least in his usual style, while others that are unsigned exhibit all his mannerisms. This revised edition has five indices: giving, first, the names of the painters; secondly, the names with *καλῶς* or *καλῇ*; thirdly, the subjects represented on the vases; fourthly, the publications in which they are engraved; and fifthly, the collections in which they are preserved. Like the *Euphronios* it has been reduced from an unmanageable quarto pamphlet to a convenient octavo volume. Every one who would study Greek vases must begin with Klein's two books.—C. T.

I regret to learn from M. Salomon Reinach that I was in error in stating last month that he was preparing a catalogue of the Museum at Constantinople to replace the catalogue published by him five years ago and now out of print. M. Reinach informs me that almost all the Celtic and Roman antiquities at the Cluny Museum at Paris have lately been removed to the Museum of Saint Germain, including the very notable collection of Roman glass from the necropolis of Poitiers. He adds that the Museum of Saint Germain has lately acquired a dagger with anthropoid handle in bronze, found in the department of the Charente, which forms an important addition to the small series of such daggers hitherto known.

CECIL TORR.

No acquisition of classical antiquities of any importance has been made at the British Museum during the past month. A scheme has been sanctioned for converting the old Print Room into a gallery of sepulchral monuments. Over two hundred reliefs will be exhibited on the walls, and the floor will be occupied by large sarcophagi. At present the room is cut in two by a floor at an awkward height: this will be removed later on, and a new floor built lower down on a level with that of the Elgin gallery, sufficient space remaining below for a good basement room. Meanwhile the upper rows of reliefs will be built into their permanent places in the walls, those destined for the lower rows remaining for a time on the present floor.—C. T.

When I visited Iasos in the month of March, a vessel of the Turkish navy had just left, which had been engaged for some weeks previously in shipping large blocks of marble extracted from the ruins for use in public works at Constantinople. This and other accessible sites in the neighbourhood have for many years past furnished their tribute for the dockyard and other constructions of the capital. In order to find suitable stones, the captain destroyed a portion of the mediæval wall which surrounds the peninsula, and in the foundations he came across a series of

inscribed bases lying on their sides. With a care, which, had it been exercised by others charged with a similar mission, would have preserved many valuable documents, he had them extracted whole and deposited on board. I trust that they are by this time in the Imperial Museum. Some gentlemen in Choulouk obtained copies of these inscriptions, and I presume they are those published by Contoleon in the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* for March. If this is so, the circumstances of their discovery have been withheld; and, as the name of Iasos does not appear in any, M. Foucart has been induced to conjecture that they may come from Passala. The wall in question is entirely composed of ancient remains; and were it carefully destroyed, we should probably possess more inscriptions from Iasos than from any site in Turkey.—W. R. PATON.

The *Times* of the 4th of May describes the discovery of an early Christian cemetery near Alexandria. The *Academy* of the 23rd of April contains a report on the necropolis of Tell-el-Yahoudeh; and discusses on the 30th of April and the 7th of May a Roman altar at South Shields. The *Athenaeum* of the 7th of May describes the results of Mr. Penrose's work at the Olympieion at Athens.

Revue Archéologique. Jan.—Feb. 1887. Paris.

1. 'Fouilles de Suse.' M. Dieulafoy gives a short statement of his excavations during 1885-86, accompanied by two coloured plates from the tiled walls of the palace of Darius Hystaspes, representing archers of the royal guard. 2. M. Berthelot publishes the result of his examination of certain metals and minerals from ancient Chaldaea. 5. A letter from M. Ary Renan, communicating an interesting fragment of a green stone cone with a curious Phoenician (?) relief, purchased at Beyrût. 6. An account by M. Cagnat of the Phoenician necropolis of Vaga (*Silius Italicus*, iii. 259) excavated during the Tunis campaign. The mode of sepulture and the forms of tomb are of the characteristic Phoenician types, but, contrary to the usual Phoenician custom, they contained no ornaments of any kind; types of the funerary vases are given on pl. iii. iv. 7. M. Reinach's very important 'Chronique d'Orient' contains as usual all the latest information on current archaeological topics; among much that is valuable is a long report from Mr. Ramsay of his researches in Asia Minor during 1886. 8. M. Mowat contributes the text of a new Gaulish inscription discovered at Orgon.—C. S.

Gazette Archéologique. Jan.—Feb. 1887. Paris.

1. M. Saglio publishes a black-figured oinochoe with the blinding of Polyphemos, formerly in the Campana Collection and now in the Louvre. 2. M. Choisy summarises the course and results of the French excavations at Susa, giving a coloured plate of part of the tiled frieze of lions from the palace of Artaxerxes Mnemon.—C. T.

Gazette des Beaux Arts. May, 1887. Paris.

2. M. Maxime Collignon on ancient sculpture in the British Museum.—C. T.

Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. Jan.—Feb. 1887. Athens and Paris.

1. M. Holleaux publishes an archaic female head found within the temple of Apollo Ptoos. 3. M. Pierre Paris describes the excavations at Elatea, at the temple of Athene Cranaia. 8. M. Foucart publishes two inscriptions relating to building at the Peiræus in 394, 393 B.C.—C. T.

The same. March, 1887.

4. M. Holleaux publishes an archaic marble torso of an 'Apollo' and an archaic bronze mirror handle in

the form of a male figure with other fragments, all found within the temple of Apollo Ptoos. 5. M. Lechat describes the excavations undertaken at Peiræus in consequence of the discovery of the inscriptions mentioned above.—C. T.

Εφημερίς ἀρχαιολογική. 1886. Part 4. Athens.

1. Phillos publishes an inscription relating to building at Eleusis. 5. Stais discusses some late marble statues from Epidaurus. 7. Palaiologos Georgiu publishes an inscription from the Acropolis recording the victory of Aischylos with his Oresteia.—C. T.

Athenische Mittheilungen. 1886: part 4. Athens.

1. Dörfeld discusses, from the architectural side, the newly discovered Peisistratid temple of Athene on the Acropolis. 2. Studniczka announces several happy restorations of statues by fitting together fragments found on the Acropolis. 3. Böhlau publishes an Athenian red-figured pyxis with Perseus and the Graiai. 4. Petersen discusses archaic statues of Nike, in relation to one such lately found on the Acropolis. 5. Schuchhardt fixes the sites of Kolophon, Notion and Klaros; describes their ruins, and publishes some inscriptions found there. 6. Lolling and Wolters describe the domed tomb lately found near Volo.—C. T.

Römische Mittheilungen. 1887: part 1. Rome.

1. Helbig publishes two new busts, one in marble and the other in bronze, of Livia the wife of Augustus. 3. The Conte di Monale describes antiquities found on the site of Fescennium, near Corchiano. 4. Dümmeler publishes an inscribed fibula from Praeneste.—C. T.

Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma. 1887. Rome.

Part 1. 4. Some fragments of sculpture, particularly a youthful Paris or Ganymede. Part 2. 2. Monument of a cobbler, with ingenious treatment of a pair of boots as a pediment group. 3. A head of the youthful Pan. Part 3. 1. Fine bas-relief of the adoration of the Dioscuri. Part 4. 1. Fine Athenian sepulchral relief.—C. T.

Archäologisches Jahrbuch. 1886: part 4. Berlin.

1. Kalkmann discusses representations of Aphrodite on the swan, publishing two red-figured vases in the Berlin Museum with this subject. 2. Heydemann discusses representations of the *φύλακες*, chiefly from vases. 3. Fränkel publishes a vase by Hischylos in the Berlin Museum.—C. T.

The same. 1887: part 1.

1. Michaelis pays a merited tribute to the memory of Wilhelm Henzen. 2. von Sybel publishes a small bronze figure in the British Museum, and a fragment of a helmet with a figure in relief in the Berlin Museum. 3. Dümmeler publishes archaic vases, etc. from Tanagra. 4. Milchhofer discusses reliefs of the presentation of offerings. 5. Böhlau publishes some very early Attic vases. 6. von Rohden publishes a fresco from Pompeii, apparently copied from the Hermes of Praxiteles.—C. T.

Register zur Archäologische Zeitung, Jahrg. I.-XLIII.

THE thanks of all archaeologists are due to the German Institute for this excellent index. Only those who have themselves toiled through the back numbers of the *Zeitung* can realise what a labour this register must have entailed in compilation, and what weariness of the spirit it will save in the future.—C. S.

Antike Denkmäler. 1886. Berlin.

This publication—the first of the new series—consists of twelve folio plates and four and a half pages of explanatory text, in a portfolio. It will be noticed at length next month.—C. T.

OBITUARY.

JOHANNES HEINRICH WILHELM HENZEN, commonly called Wilhelm Henzen, was born at Bremen on the 24th of January 1816, and died at Rome on the 27th January 1887. He was trained in his native city, and afterwards in the Universities of Bonn and Berlin; and in 1840 he started on his travels. He came first to Paris and thence to London, acquiring perfect command of English and French; next he went to Rome, and after travelling with Welcker and Ulrichs in Greece and Asia Minor, and in Sicily, in November 1842 he settled at Rome for good. He forthwith joined the Archaeological Institute there, and soon acquired the paramount influence within it which he retained to the last; and it was mainly due to him that the Institute grew from a private association to an Imperial German foundation. In spite of indifferent health, his activity was almost incredible: for besides his better known work, the correspondence and management of the Institute, and the editing of its *Annali* and *Bullettini* were for many years almost entirely in his hands. He worked at first at Greek antiquities, and the first Latin inscriptions that he published were two from Athens; but he soon found his true sphere, and the volume with which he completed Orelli's collection of select Latin inscriptions established his reputation in all countries as one of the very first authorities on Latin epigraphy. This was not published until 1856, but for fully ten years before he had been busy with the project of a *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. This project found favour at Berlin; but its execution in the thorough-going way that he desired was not assured until after his friend Theodor Mommsen had set an example with his edition of the Neapolitan inscriptions in 1852. In 1853 the editing of the *Corpus* was entrusted to Henzen, Mommsen, and de Rossi. Henzen's own work is mainly in volume vi., dealing with the Latin inscriptions of the city of Rome; and for this he obtained new material by promoting excavations at the Grove of the Arval Brethren, on whose acts he published an independent treatise. He was moreover one of the founders of the *Ephemeris Epigraphica*. Due honour was rendered at his funeral by the authorities at Rome; and his charming courtesy to strangers will long be remembered in many countries.—CECIL TORR.

CARL SCHAPER, editor of Vergil, died 6 Oct. 1886. His father, who had been enabled to complete his medical studies by the generosity of Heinrich Ritter, afterwards Professor of Philosophy in Göttingen, did much to promote education in Elbing, where the eldest of his eight children, Carl Heinrich Julius, was born 15 March 1828. At the age of seven the boy was sent to Elbing Gymnasium, which he left for Halle University at Michaelmas 1844. In Halle he attended the lectures of Meier, Bernhardt, Pott,

Schaller, Erdmann, Max Duncker, and courses on education and theology. At Easter 1846 he went to Berlin where Franz and Trendelenburg, Lachmann, and especially Boeckh, watched over his studies. His mother's death in 1847, philosophical studies, and the political excitement of the time, kept him in continual agitation. Posting a letter on the 18th of March 1848, he found his return blocked by a barricade, and in the tumult received wounds. In January 1850 he migrated to Königsberg, where he completed his studies under Lobeck and Lehrs. After holding masterships at Danzig, Tilsit, Königsberg, he was appointed in 1861 head master of the Gymnasium at Insterburg; at Michaelmas 1864 Director in Lyck; in July 1868 Sommerbrodt's successor in the Friedrich Wilhelm Gymnasium in Posen; in July 1872 Gustav Kiessling's successor in the important Joachimsthal Gymnasium at Berlin. Here he remained to his death and to him the success of the school in its new quarters is due. The last months of his life were clouded by severe illness, bravely borne. His last connected words were: *Grüsse an das Joachimsthal*.

He spoke Latin fluently and could write Latin verse. His publications on metre and on Vergil induced the Weidmann firm, after Ladewig's death (1874), to entrust him with the revision of their Vergil with German notes, and since 1882 he wrote the report on the Roman bucolic poets for Bursian's *Jahresbericht*; in 1885, when his mortal sickness was upon him, he further undertook, in the place of the deceased Genthe, the report on the *Aeneid* for the same serial. The last days before his death he read through Ribbeck's new edition of the text.

For Wölfflin's *Archiv. für lat. Lexikographie* he undertook to excerpt Hor. c. and epod. and Valerius Flaccus, and lived to send in the answers to about 200 questions.

He belonged to a society of scholars who met weekly, latterly fortnightly, to read together the Greek dramatists. He was so satisfied with the result that he formed a similar circle from the teachers of the Joachimicum. He was also an active member of the Archaeological, Paedagogical and other learned societies, and took an active part in many patriotic, literary and philanthropic agitations. 'Trust in God appeared to him the one true foundation of every society, the family, the school, the state.' (From the obituary notice by G. J. Schneider in Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, 'Nekrologe' 1886, II. pp. 129—146).

2 March in Tübingen aet. 56 DR. HERMANN ALF. FREIHERR VON GUTSCHMIDT, Professor of History in the University. His works relate chiefly to eastern history, Egypt, Assyria, Macedonia, Troilus Pompeius. In Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* III. he had an article 'The apocalypse of Esra and its later recensions.'

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Athenaeum: 26 Mar.; notice of Mahaffy's *Alexander's Empire*: notes from Athens (opening of American school—Excavation of Delphi) by S. P. Lambros. 9 April: notes from Athens (Excavation of the temple of Zeus Olympius, etc.), by W. Leaf; notice of Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte u. Untersuchungen der altchristlichen Literatur* II. 3 and 4. 30 April: Review of Verrall's *Septem*. 7 May: Review of Morris' *Odyssey*; short report of Penrose's lecture at Athens on the temple of Zeus Olympius.

Academy: 23 April; notice of Sandys' *Easter Vacation in Greece*; a letter from Max Müller in defence of the theory that *nomen* is for *gnomen*: 30 April; reviews—Morris' *Odyssey* by E. D. A. Morshead, of C. Weizsäcker's *das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche* by R. B. Drummond, of G. G. Ramsay's *Selections from Tibullus and Propertius* by R. Ellis; a letter from G. F. Browne on the Cod. Amiatinus: 7 May; review of Gertz' *Seneca's Dialogues* by H. Nettleship, a letter from K. Hamann on Cod. Amiatinus, a letter from W. T. Watkin on an inscription

on a Roman altar found at South Shields: 14 May; review of Mahaffy's *Alexander's Empire* by F. T. Richards, letter from E. A. Gardner on the inscriptions of Naukratis.

Philological Society. The last Abstract of Proceedings (5 Nov. 1886—18 Mar. 1887) gives an account of the following papers:—*Prof. Sayce*, On the origin of the Augment in the Indo-European verb, on the origin of the characteristic *r* of the passive in the Italic and Celtic languages; *Whitley Stokes*, Notes of a Philological tour; *H. Sweet*, The Laws of Sound Change; *J. A. H. Murray*, Annual Report of the Society's New English Dictionary; *J. Burnell*, Sanskrit as parent of the Modern Aryan dialects of India; *H. Bradley*, Gothic personal names; *J. Burnell*, the inscription of Gortyn; *Prof. Skeat*, English Etymologies.

The following articles on classical subjects have appeared in other English Magazines: *Blackwood* (May): Memoir of the Rev. W. Lucas Collins, *Nineteenth Century* (May): The greater Gods of Olympus, II. Apollo, by W. E. Gladstone, *Scottish Review* (April): The apocryphal character of the Moabite Stone, by Rev. A. Löwy; The Subjects of the Byzantine Empire, by D. Bikelas; Recent Archaeology in Euboea, *Walford's Antiquarian* (May): Two short articles on the House of Aldus, Part I., and on Excavations at Ostia.

Expositor, April.—Professor Westcott, writing on the R.V., gives examples of the practical gain arising from its exactness in grammatical details. Mr. J. Macpherson continues the discussion on the Origin of the Christian Ministry. He holds that, in the Apostolic Church, there was but one regular office, that of the presbyter, but that in the larger communities, where several presbyters were required, the presbyters were divided into superior (*ἐπίσκοποι*) and inferior (*διδασκαλοί*); further, that during the first six centuries the *ἐπίσκοπος* was simply pastor of a congregation.

May.—Professor Harnack gives in chronological order the data we possess for determining the development of the Christian ministry, and then deals more particularly with the original nature of the episcopal office. His conclusion is that both the episcopal and the presbyterial theories are wrong. The development was very complicated. By the end of the first century we find the bishop presiding over the services of the Church, administering its finances, acting as its representative to those without, but himself to some extent controlled by the council of presbyters. English readers will feel less confidence in these results when they learn the cost at which they have been obtained. 'The Epistle to the Ephesians was not written by Paul, but a considerable time after his death.' 'It seems to me very improbable that the Acts of the Apostles was written during the first century.' So the Pastoral Epistles and that of St. James are relegated to the second century. Mr. T. E. Page, in somewhat magisterial style, reproves the Revisers for their rendering of *Acts* i. 16—21. We agree with him on the whole, but cannot think that the latter half of verse 19 was spoken by St. Peter, just after the event referred to. Professor Godet writes on the Epistle to the Ephesians, and Professor Warfield on recent American literature relating to the N. T.

Blätter f. d. Bayer. Gymnasialschulwesen.—xxiii (1887) 2. und 3. Heft. L. Dittmeyer, the spuriousness of *Aristot. hist. an. bk. ix* (part 2).—T. Stangl, *Epikritisches zu Cic. or. und Brutus*.—G. Schepss, *Zu Suetons Fortleben im Mittelalter*.—J. Melber,

Zu den angeblich aus Dio Cassius stammenden planudischen Excerpten.—Proschberger handles severely Gebhardi's *Ein aesthetischer Kommentar zu den lyr. Dichtungen des Horaz*. Paderborn. 1885.—Reviews (1) of Leo's *Plantus* vol. i (Berlin, Weidmann, 1885) by Weissenhorn; (2) of L. Müller's *Der saturnische Vers* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1885) by 'E.' (3) of Wecklein's ed. of *Wolffg. Bauer's Eurip. Herakl.* München, 1885, and of Wecklein's 2nd ed. of *Soph. Antig.* (ib. 1885) by K. Metzger. (4) of W. Christ, *Platonische Studien* (Abh. d. bayer. Akad. 1 Cl. xvii Bd ii. Abt.) by Baumann (5) of Slameczka's *researches into Dem. de f. l.* (Wien, Holder, 1885) by H. Ortner. (6) of Ed. Kurtz, *Die Sprichwörter-sammlung des Maximus Planudes* (Leipzig, Neumann, 1886) and of Wölflin, *Sprüche der sieben Weisen* (Sitzungsber. d. bayer. Akad. 1886, reviewed also by Studemund in the *Wochenschr. f. klass. Philol.* No. 50, 1886) and H. Schenkl, *Pythagorensprüche* (Wiener Studien 1886), the original of the *Syriac* version printed by Gildemeister in *Hermes* iv 81 seq., all by Krumbacher (Dr. J. Scheibmeyer in Munich has long been collecting similar selections of maxims). (7) of Mommsen's *History*, vol. v, by Gruber. Shorter notices of (1) Weissenborn's *Livy*. I 1 Bk. 1 (8th ed. by H. J. Müller, Berl. Weidmann, 1885). (2) *Tac. hist. erklärt* von Ed. Wolff. I (bk. I 11. Berl. Weidmann, 1886). (3) *Tac. opera*. Rec. Joh. Müller. II hist. et op. minora. (Prag, Tempsky, 1887). (4) G. Gemss, *Wörterb. zu . . Corn. Nep. Paderborn, Schoeningh*. 1886. (5) *Corn. Nep. . . v. J. Siebelis*. 11th ed. by M. Jancovius (Leipzig, Teubner 1885).—Heft 4. L. Dittmeyer, the spuriousness of *Arist. h. an. bk. ix* (pt. iii and last).—Reviews (1) by C. Hammer of H. Nohl *Cic. orat. selectae. iii de imp. Pomp. in Catil. or. iv. Lips. Freytag*. 1886. pp. xvi, 65, 2 by Hans Kern of *Vergili Aeneis schol. in usum ed. W. Klouček* (bibl. script. gr. et rom. ed. cur. C. Schenkl). ibid. 1886. pp. ii. 338. geb. 1 M. 50 Pf.; (3) by H. Staudmüller of *Eurip. Medea*. Zweite Aufl. erklärt von Hans v. Arnim. Berlin, Weidmann. 1886. pp. xxvi, 120. 1 M. 50 Pf. (not a revision of Schöne's edition, but an entirely new work).

Mnemosyne. Nova Series. xv (1887), pt. 2. Lugd. Bat. Brill. *Quaestiones Graecae*, II. De Ostracismo, scripsit T. M. J. Valetot (criticisms, e.g., of Grote).—*Platonica*, scripsit H. van Herwerden (continuation of notes on Plato printed in his *Lectiones Rhetoricae*, Lugd. Bat. 1882, pp. 21–60. Deals with Hipp. maior and minor, Ion, Menexenus, Clitophon, Phaedrus, and schol. *Phileb.* p. 56e).—Ad Lucianum, scripsit K. G. P. Schwartz (continued from xiv 233. Deals with *Asinus*, *Iuppiter conf.* and *Iuppiter trag.*, *Jcaromenippus*).—Ad *Aristoph.* *Pac.* 48, 1159, scripsit J. van Leeuwen, Jr.—De *Tibulli elegiarum structura*, scripsit H. T. Karsten (defends the vulgate from the transpositions of Haase, Ribbeck, Prie, R. Richter, Fritzsche, Bachrens).—Ad *Aen.* vi 579 sq., scripsit P. Hoekstra (transposes *caeli* and *terrae*).—Addendum ad *Catull.* 6 10, scripsit J. P. Postgate (his conjecture *cassa* had been anticipated).

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie u. Pädagogik, ed. Fleckeisen u. Masius, Leipzig, 1887. Zweites Heft contains (1) B. Keil, *Antiphon κατά τῆς μητριαῖς*, a general criticism of the speech. (2) A. Ludwig, *Zu Homerischen Hymneshymnos*, three emendations, viz. v. 152, *ἢν πάλλῃσι παρ' ἰγνύσι λαίφος*, v. 259, *λυγροῖσιν*, v. 427, *κραίνοντ'*. (3) K. Tümpel, *Kallione*, some notes on this goddess. (4) K. Brugmann, *der Ursprung von ἀλλήλων*, explaining the word on the analogy of 'einander', 'one another'. (5) F. Polle, *Zu Thukydides*, suggesting in II. 20, 4, the reading *τρισχίλιοι γὰρ πολῖται* for *ὅπλαται*. (6) A. Schmidt,

die Archonten Nikodemus u. Agathokles u. das stumme Iota, determining the date of Agathokles by palaeographical considerations. (7) P. Schulze, *Lukianos als Quelle für die Kenntnis der Tragödie*, a collection of notices of the tragic drama in Lucian. (8) H. Magnus, *Zu den Metamorphosen des Ovidius*, a discussion of I. 15 (suggesting *utque aether tellus*) VI. 53-58, V. 460, VII. 47, IX. 414-418. (9) W. Gilbert, *Zur Erklärung von Martialis Epigrammen*, a number of small criticisms on Friedländer's edition. (10) K. Hachtmann, *Zu Ciceros Reden gegen Verres*, suggesting in IV. 9, *privatis in rebus for parvis in rebus*.

Romanische Forschungen, Organ für romanische Sprachen und Mittellatein herausgegeben von KARL VOLLMÖLLER. Erlangen, A. Deichert.

Band I 1883. (Many of the articles do not fall into the province of the *Review*.) K. Hoffmann, T. M. Auracher, Der Langobardische Dioskorides des Marcellus Virgilius pp. 49-106 (book I only is as yet printed. The editors have left in the text many impossible forms, which a reference to the Greek would have enabled them to correct. Thus in p. 51 (last line) they cite *acrum* as occurring in f° 27^a. The words there are 'ignem acrum.' *Ignis sacer* seems to have been written as one word, *ignisacer*. In several places this mistake occurs; in f° 29^a *ignem acrum* appears as *igne acrum*. I hope to write for the *Journal of Philology* a paper on the text and latinity of this very important example of low Latin).—Hermann Rönisch, Die lexikalischen Eigenthümlichkeiten der Latinität des sogen. Hegesippus, pp. 256-321. (maintains, against Fr. Vogel, De Hegesippo, qui dicitur, Josephi interprete, Erlangen 1880, the identity of Hegesippus and Ambrose).—W. Foerster, Das italienische *dunque* und dessen Herkunft, pp. 322-325 (from *donique*, confounded with *denique*).—Hermann Rönisch, Textkritische Bemerkungen zum Longobardischen Dioskorides, pp. 413-414.—Fr. Vogel, Zu Hegesippus pp. 415-417 (additions and corrections to Rönisch's paper in pp. 256-321).—Hermann Rönisch, Zur biblischen Latinität aus dem cod. Sangallensis der Evangelien, pp. 419-426.

Band II Heft 2. 1885. C. Fritzsche, Die lateinischen Visionen des Mittelalters bis zur Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Culturgeschichte, pp. 247-279 (a valuable contribution to the illustration of Bede, h. e. v 12-14, of Dante and of St. Patrick's purgatory. The conclusion, promised for the next part, has not yet appeared).—Hermann Rönisch, Lexikalische Excerpte aus weniger bekannten lateinischen Schriften. Erste Serie. Aus der Uebersetzung der Apostelgeschichte im Codex Gigas der Stockholmer Bibliothek, pp. 280-301.—The same, Lexikalisches aus Leidener lateinischen Juvenalscholien der Karolingerzeit, pp. 302-313 (from the scholia on Sat. III in cod. Voss. 18 saec. x, published by Schopen, Bonn, 1847).—The same, Etymologische Miscellen pp. 314-316.—The same, Das Subst. *bolunda* pp. 317-318.—The same, Das Adjectiv *pronostonus*, pp. 318-319.—The same, Das Adjectiv *cererosus* pp. 319-320.

II Heft 3. 1886. C. v. Paucker, Die Latinität des Joannes Cassianus pp. 391-448.—Hermann Rönisch, Lexikalische Excerpte aus weniger bekannten lateinischen Schriften. Zweite Serie. Aus dem Anonymus Valesii, aus Lucani Commenta Bernensia, aus dem Chronographus vom Jahre 354 und Polemii Silvii Laterculus pp. 449-472.—The same, Etymologisches. Das französische *la troussé* (from **torosa*). Das italienische *corone* (in support of Ferrari's derivation, adopted by Diez, from *carus*, Rönisch cites Philargy, on Verg. g. 11 517 *mergites . . . quidam cavos dicunt*). Ital. brocco, französ. broche (from *Βρόχος*) pp. 473-476.

Vol. III Heft 1. 1886 contains only a French poem of the 13 cent.

The second part of vol. III will contain: Jul. Zupitza: on what text is the O. E. version of the story of Apollonius of Tyre founded; also a conjecture on Aldhelm.—Herm. Rönisch, Lexikalische Excerpte, ser. 3.

Later will appear: the continuation of Dioscorides; the Oxford Benedictine rule (saec. VII) ed. by Konrad Hofmann.

Zeitschrift für oesterr. Gymnasien, xxxviii (1887) Heft 2. I H. Rönisch: Latein aus entlegenen Quellen. New words, or new examples, or strange forms from (1) Apulei (?) *Physiognomia* (in Rose's *Anecdota*, Berl. 1864, vol. i). (2) *Liber Monstrorum* (in Haupt's *Opusc.* ii, Leipz. 1876). (3) *Acta S. Timothei*, ed. Usener (1877). (4) *Scholia Bobiensia* and *Scholiasta Gronovianus* (in Orelli's *Cicero*, vol. v pt. 2). (5) *Fragmentum evang. S. Lucae Ambrosianum*, saec. 6 (in Ceriani's *Monumenta*, i, Mediol. 1861). The shortened forms *desirium* (for *desiderium*, Cael. Aurel. chron. i § 77) and *desiro* (Itin. Alex. c. 27 p. 15, 9 ed. Volkman) carry back the origin of our *desire*, subst. and verb, to low Latin.—II A Scheindler, favorable review of A. Breusing's *Die Nautik der Alten*. Bremen. 1886. III J. Kirste, favorable review of Turoman, *Greek grammar*. Belgrade 1886. The first ever published in the Servian language. IV A. Kornitzer, favorable reviews of (1) C. Meissner's *Cic. Cato maior*, 2 umgearb. Aufl. Leipz. Teubner 1885. (2) F. Hofmann's ausgewählte Briefe von Cicero. Berlin, Weidmann. 1 5th ed. 1884. II 2 ed by G. Andresen. 1885. V Tegge, *Studien zur latein. Synonymik* (Berl. Weidmann. 1886) recommended by J. Golling. VI E. Engelbrecht *Claudiani Mamerti opera* (Vienna 1885) recommended by H. St. Sedlmayer. VII J. M. Stowasser attests 'the enormous importance' of Huemer's *Virgilii Maronis grammatici opera*, Teubner. 1886 and makes several suggestions for a new edition.

Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, Feb. 12. H. Holtzinger, *Kunsthistorische Studien* (K. Lange). 'Interesting so far as it deals with the origins of ecclesiastical architecture.' The greater part of the notice is taken up with the reviewer's own theory.—K. Abicht, *Herodotos iii. und iv. für den Schulgebrauch erklärt* (W. Gemoll). 'New editions, essentially identical with the previous ones.'—C. Frick, *Die Quellen Augustini im xvi. Buche seiner Schrift de civitate Dei* (H. Rönisch). 'Complete and accurate.'—A. Delattre, *L'Asie occidentale dans les Inscriptions Assyriennes* (Schrader). 'Useful.'—O. Schrader, *Linguistisch-historische Forschungen zur Handelsgeschichte und Warenkunde* (G. Meyer). 'Treats a difficult subject with great skill and competent knowledge.'—H. Collitz, *Die neueste Sprachforschung und die Erklärung des indogermanischen Ablauts* (H. Ziemer). 'Vehement rather than convincing.'

Feb. 19. J. Král, *Sophocles Tragoediae*, ii; *Antigona* (H. Müller). 'Careful text-recension; notes in Bohemian.'—A. Neupert, *De Demosthenicarum quae feruntur epistularum fide et auctoritate* (W. Nitsche). 'A careful examination, especially on considerations of language, resulting in a verdict of spuriousness.' Reviewer makes some important contributions to the discussion.—O. Güthling, *P. Vergili Maronis Eucoliae Georgica Aeneis* (W. Gebhardt). 'A Teubner text, intended to take the place, in schools, of Ribbeck's edition, which is objected to by conservative teachers. Lacks critical insight.'—J. N. Madvig, *Titi Livii historiarum romanorum libri qui supersunt, ex recensione J. N. Madvigii. Quartum ediderunt J. N. Madvigius et J. L. Ussingius*. Vol. ii, 1, libros a xxi^o

ad xxviam continens (-σ). Reviewer notices various emendations and agreements with other scholars in Book 21.—H. Sauppe, *De Phratris Atticis commentatio* [Göttingen program] (Thalheim). 'Valuable.'—N. H. Michel, *Du droit de cité romain. Études d'épigraphie juridique. I. Des signes distinctifs de la qualité de citoyens romaine* [sic] (P. Willems). 'Discursive, not free from mistakes.'—H. Berger, *Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Erdkunde der Griechen. Erste Abtheilung. Die geographie der Iouier* (D. Detlefsen). 'Text and notes contain an astonishing wealth of learning.'—G. J. Allman, *Greek Geometry from Thales to Euclid* (F. Hutsch). Descriptive notice.

Feb. 26. Oskar Sommer, *Gottfried Semper* (R. Borrmann). Descriptive notice; reviewer had written on Semper as an archaeologist in the *Wochenschrift*, 1885, 9 and 10.—Auguste Franchetti, *Le Rane di Aristofane tradotte in versi italiani con introduzione e note di Domenico Comparetti* (C. v. Holzinger). 'Shows taste, and some poetical power.'—R. Wagner, *De Infinitivo apud oratores Atticos cum articulo coniuncto* [Schwerin program] (W. Nitsche). 'Laborious and sensible.'—P. Uhle, *Quaestiones de Orationum Demostheni falso addictarum scriptoribus. Particula altera: De Orationum 33, 34, 56 scriptoribus* (W. Nitsche). 'Has merits, though certainty may be impossible.'—A. Schäfer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit. 2te Ausg.* 2 Band (Th. Thalheim). 'Revision carefully carried out by Max Hoffmann after the death of the author, who had only revised vol. i.'—Th. Oesterlen, *Konik und Humor bei Horaz. Zweiter Heft: Die Oden* (W. Mewes). 'Exaggerated: caricatures Horace.'—Julius Asbach, *Cornelius Tacitus* (A. Eussner). 'Interesting, if unsound.'—A. Cartault, *De quelques représentations de navires empruntées à des vases primitifs provenant d'Athènes* (E. Assmann). 'Conclusions cannot be accepted unhesitatingly.'—P. Willems, *Les élections municipales à Pompéi* (M. Voigt). 'Careful and important.'—H. Daniel-Lacombe, *Le droit funéraire à Rome* (M. Voigt). 'Not on a level with the recent literature of the subject.'

March 5. H. Collitz, *Die neueste Sprachforschung und die Erklärung des indogermanischen Ablautes* (K. Brugmann). Detailed polemic, with a good deal of personality.—Georg Ranscher, *De scholiis Homericis ad rem metricam pertinentibus* (A. Ludwig). 'A good idea, not quite satisfactorily worked out.'—Franz Müller, *Dispositionen zur den Reden bei Thukydides* (G. Behrendt). 'Well adapted for schools.'—J. Proschberger, *Fünf Oden des Horaz in moderner deutscher Übertragung* [Regensburg program] (W. Mewes). 'Of more than average merit.'—B. Dahl, *Zur Handschriftenkunde und Kritik des ciceronischen Cato Maior, II. Codices Parisini* (H. Deiter). Descriptive notice.—P. Schwenke, *Des Presbyter Hadoardus Cicero-excerpte nach E. Narduccis Abschrift des Cod. Vat. Reg. 1762* (H. Deiter). 'Important for the text-criticism of Cicero.'—E. Kurtz, *Tierbeobachtung und Tierliebhaberei der alten Griechen* (O. Keller). 'Slight and defective.'—A. F. Pott, *Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft und Carl Abel's Aegyptische Sprachstudien* = Einzelbeiträge zur allgemeinen und vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft (H. Ziemer). Descriptive notice of Pott's examination of Abel's theories.

Rivista di Filologia e d' Istruzione Classica (ed. Comparetti, Müller, and Flechia, Turin). Anno XV. Fasc. 1 and 2. 1886 contains (1) Remigius Sabbadini, *Quae libri III et VII Aeneidos cum universo poemate ratio intercedat*, showing, among other things, by a minute analysis of the inconsistencies of the Aeneid, that Book VII. was composed after Books VIII.-XI.,

and that Book III. was composed after Books I. II., IV.-VII. (2) G. Bertolotto, *Il Codice Modenese di Luciano*, an account of this MS., which contains twenty-six works, and is assigned to the tenth or eleventh century. A full collation of the *δίκη φωνήεντων* and other notes are added. (3) Luigi Valmaggia, *Notizia di un Codice Eporediese delle Etimologie di Isidoro*, an account, with partial collation, of the MS. of the *Origines* in the Capitol of Ivrea. Fasc. 3-6 contain (1) E. Pais, *Strygoniana*, an article of 150 pages, dealing chiefly with Strabo's obligations to earlier writers for the description of countries which he had not visited. (2) F. Ramorino, *Notizia di alcuni manoscritti italiani del Cato Maior e del Laelius*, with a collation of three Laurentian MSS. (I. 45, XLV. 2, and LXVI. 32) of the Cato Maior. Reviews of various school editions are also included.

B. Stade's *Zeitschrift f. d. Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*. Giessen. Heft I. 1887. F. Baethgen (pp. 1-60) concludes his investigation of seventeen Psalms (see *Ztschr. f. d. All. Wiss.* 1886, pp. 261-288) which Theodore of Mopsuestia in his commentary seems to have treated as Maccabean, representing David as having composed them *ἐκ προσώπου τῶν Μακκαβαίων*. Baethgen gives copious extracts from Theodore's commentary, which he reproduces from Corderius' Catena (Antwerp. 1643-1646). He thus brings into notice many passages of Theodore's commentary, which do not appear in Migne's edition (Tom. 66, Series Graeca). He quotes at length (pp. 7-10) a very valuable passage, where Theodore compares the versions of Symmachus and the LXX and criticises their style of translation. In another place (p. 40) Baethgen shows that the Greek text of Theodore's commentary upon Ps. lxi. 22 differs considerably from the Latin text given in Migne's edition. As the Greek version does not adopt the view that the primary application of the passage was to New Testament events, the variation in the Latin seems to denote an attempt to improve upon Theodore's sentiments in an orthodox direction. The historical references to Maccabean times show thorough acquaintance with the books of Maccabees. Theodore's comments are based upon the LXX version.—S. Reckendorf (pp. 61-90) contributes an article upon the value of the Ethiopic version for the reconstruction of the text of the LXX. He gives examples of the variations found in the Ethiopic version in the course of a brief collation of Genesis, and concludes that those variations are not to be accounted for by the carelessness of scribes, but by the character of the text employed by the translators. He will not commit himself upon the question whether the Ethiopic does not show traces of the influence of an Arabic or a Coptic translation upon which it was based. He calls attention to the marked agreement in certain passages of the Ethiopic with MS. 129 of the LXX.—The number concludes with a brief notice of E. Vischer's theory of a Hebrew original for the Apocalypse. Accepting Vischer's conclusions the writer gives a full list of the words, phrases, and passages, which he thinks an analysis of the book shows to have been interpolated by the Greek translator into his rendering from the Hebrew.

Theologisch Tijdschrift, xxi. 2. March 1887. Dr. H. P. Berlage criticises *Verisimilia* Civ. § 3 ('quaestio de mulieribus' in 1 Cor. xi. 1-16). The results, he thinks, are obtained by violence done to the text, and the authors cannot escape the charge of precipitation.—J. H. A. Michelsen continues his 'critical investigation of the original text of the Epistle to the Romans'; in the present article, following in the

steps of C. H. Weisse, he endeavours to free the text of the Epistle from interpolations, amounting to a very considerable portion of the whole; some of these are 'inappropriate quotations from the O. T.' [e.g. III. 13-18], others additions of a miscellaneous character [e.g. V. 1-11]. He distinguishes five recensions of the Epistle, and supposes the connexion with the Romans to have been introduced in the second.—Dr. J. A. Bruins defends his interpretation of Augustine Brev. Coll. III. 13 *dimisisse autem in basilica novorum quaecunque reproba scripta haeticorum* against Heer van Gilse; (a) *dimisisse* means 'left behind'; (b) *bas. novorum* are to be taken together; for the latter should be read *Novorum*, perhaps an abbreviation for *Novatianorum*. Reviews: *La religion à Rome sous les Sévères* par Jean Réville by C. P. Tiele (a masterpiece in its way; but the author should have avoided such words as 'Pagans,' and might have traced more clearly the earlier manifestations of the religious phenomena which mark the age of the Severi); *Priscillian, ein neugefundener Lat. Schriftsteller des 4. Jahrhunderts.* Vortrag von Dr. Georg Schepps by Dr. M. A. N. Rovers ('In the tracts published the supposed Priscillianus expresses the

greatest aversion to all heresies, especially Manicheism; whereas the real Pr. was represented by his contemporaries as the great heretic and follower of the Manichees')

CORRIGENDA.—p. 92, col. 1, for *δέαροι* read *δέαται*. col. 2, for 'in the middle of the refrain' read 'by the refrain.'

p. 105, col. 1, for 'Sanskrit -mānā, corresponding generally to -*mevo*, is always oxytone' read 'Sanskrit -mānā was probably at first oxytone, as in *sasrmānā*; though these participles have regularly taken the accent of the present stem, as *yājamāna*: but this accentuation is almost certainly un-original.'

p. 114, heading, for *νικηφόρος* read *νικηφόρος*. l. 16, for *ὅν δὲ ἀρχολοίη* read *ὅν πόνοος ἔδσει*.

p. 121, col. 2, l. 14, for 'and *fraglare* = *flagrare*' kept its form and sense till the African Latin, appeared, when it became *fraglare* read 'are discussed. To avoid the repetition of *r*, *fragrare* got changed in vulgar speech either into *flagrare* or *fraglare*; and the confusion was increased when the latter form came to be used also in the sense of 'burn,' as in Fronto and other Africans.'

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

BOOKS PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND.

- Aldred* (P. F.) Grammatical Notes on the Plutus of Aristophanes, together with an Introduction and a Selection of Hard Passages. 12mo. 18 pp. Cambridge. Hall. 2s.
- Antoninus*. Meditations. Translated from the Greek by Jeremy Collier, revised with Introduction and Notes by A. Zimmern. Post 8vo. 236 pp. London. W. Scott. 1s.
- Avianus*. The fables of Avianus, edited with Prolegomena, Critical Apparatus, Commentary, Excursus, and Index, by Robinson Ellis, M.A., LL.D. 8vo. xli. 161 pp. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 18s. 6d.
- Cyril* (St.) Five lectures on the mysteries and other sacramental treatises edited with Translations by the Rev. H. de Romestin. 16mo. vi. 137 pp. Oxford. Parker. 3s.
- Herodotus*. Book VIII. 1-190. With Introduction and Notes by E. S. Shuckburgh. 12mo. 190 pp. Cambridge. Pitt Press. 3s. 6d.
- Jerram* (C. S.) Anglice Reddenda; or, Extracts for

Unseen Translation for the use of Middle and Higher Forms. Second Series. 12mo. 210 pp. London. Frowde. 3s.

Ovid. Epistolarum ex Ponto liber primus. With Introduction and Notes by C. H. Keene. Post 8vo. 96 pp. London. Bell and Sons. 3s.

Plautus. Captivi. With Introduction and Notes by W. M. Lindsay. 12mo. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d.

Sappho. Memoir, Text, Selected Renderings, and a Literal Translation by H. J. Wharton, 2nd edition. 12mo. 222 pp. London. Stott. 7s. 6d.

Smith (A.) Through Cyprus. 8vo. ix. 351 pp. Map and cuts. London. Hurst and Blackett. 15s.

Sophocles. Antigone. The text closely rendered and illustrated with short notes preceded by an Introduction and Analysis by R. Broughton. Post 8vo. 120 pp. Oxford. Shrimpron. 3s. 6d.

Turner (B. D.) An elementary syntax of the Latin cases. 16mo. 19 pp. London. Rivingtons. 1s.

BOOKS PUBLISHED ON THE CONTINENT.

- Azt*. Zur Topographie von Rhegion und Messina. 4to. (36 pp.) Grimma, Gensei. 1 Mk.
- Barthold* (Th.) Krit.-exegetische Untersuchungen zu des Euripides Medea und Hippolytos. 4to. 42 pp. Hamburg. 2 Mk. 50.
- Breidl* (H.) De Aurelio Prudentio Clemente Horatii imitatore. 8vo. 52 pp. Heidelberg. Winter. 1 Mk. 60.
- Buchwald* (F.) Quaestiones Silianae. 8vo. (32 pp.). Leipzig, Fock. 80 Pf.
- Büdinger* (M.) Zeit und Schicksal bei Römern und Westariern. 8vo. 32 pp. Vienna. Gerold. 60 Pf.
- Busche* (C.) Observationes criticae in Euripidis Troades. 8vo. 48 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 75 Pf.
- Cicero*. Rede für T. Annius Milo. Für d. Schulgebrauch erklärt von R. Bouterwek. 8vo. A. Kommentar unter dem Text. III. 90 pp. B. Text und Kommentar getrennt. III. 41. 48 pp. Gotha. Perthes. Each 1 Mk. 20.
- Dell' oratore libri tre. Testo riveduto ed annotato da A. Cima. Lib. II. 8vo. xx. 156 pp. Turin. Loescher. 2 l. 50 c.
- Corpus juris civilis nella sua miglior lezione secondo

gli studi più recenti con richiami alle diverse sue parte e alle disposizioni del codice civile italiano e delle varie legislazioni moderne. 8vo. Fasc. 22-31, pp. 989-1542. Rome, Perino. Each part 50 c.

Demosthenes. L'orazione per la corona, commentata da D. Bassi. 8vo. lxx. 258 pp. Turin. Loescher. 4 lire.

Dilthey (C.) De epigrammatum graecorum syllogis quibusdam minoribus commentatio. 4to. Göttingen. Dietrich. 80 Pf.

Dissertationes philologiae Vindobonenses. Vol. I. 8vo. 348 pp. Prague. Tempsky. 7 Mk.

Engelmann (Th.) De custodiae praestatione nach römischen Recht. 8vo. Nördlingen. Beck. 3 Mk.

Gallien (K.) Lateinische Schulgrammatik. 8vo. iv. 100 pp. Berlin. Simion. 1 Mk.

Gasquy (A.) de Fabio Planciade Fulgentio, Virgilii interprete. (extr. Berl. Studien.) 8vo. 44 pp. Berlin. Calvary and Co. 1 Mk. 60.

Glück (F.) Commentario alle Pandette tradoto e arricchito di copiose note; direttori professori F. Serafini e P. Cogliolo. Disp. II.-XXIII. Libri I.-III. trad. da C. Ferrini, Libro IV. trad. da L.

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

- Landucci. 8vo. pp. 81-768, 1-48, 1-96, 1-192. Milan, Vallardi. Each part 1 lira.
- Gomperz (Th.) Zu Heraklit's Lehre und den Ueberresten seines Werkes (*extr.* Sitzungs. d. K. K. Akad. d. Wiss.) 8vo. 61 pp. Vienna. Gerold. 1 Mk.
- Hauler (E.) Neue Bruchstücke zu Sallusts Historien (*extr.* Sitzungs. d. K. K. Akad. d. Wiss.) 8vo. 66 pp. Vienna. Gerold. 1 Mk.
- Herodoti historiarum liber V. et VI. Scholarum in usum rec. A. Holder. 8vo. vii. 48, vii. 47 pp. Prague. Tempsky. Each 40 Pf.
- Hervæden (H. van.) Lucubrations Sophocleae. 8vo. Utrecht. Beijero. 1 fl.
- Hess (G.) Curæ Annæanae. Pars I. 4to. 26 pp. Altona. 80 Pf.
- Homeri. Iliadis carmina ed. A. Rzach. Pars II.: XIII.-XXIII. 12mo. 375pp. Prague. Tempsky. 1 Mk.
- Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. G. Stier. IV.-VI. 8vo. 119. 230 pp. Gotha. Perthes. 3 Mk.
- L'Odyssée. Texte grec revu et corrigé d'après les diorthoses alexandrines, accompagné d'un commentaire critique et explicatif et suivi de la Batrachomyomachie, des hymnes homériques, etc., par A. Pierron. 2nd edition. Chants I.-XII. 8vo. 542pp. Paris. Hachette. 9 fr.
- Odyssea, scholarum in usum ed. P. Cauer. Pars II. Rhaps. XIII.-XXIV. 12mo. 228 pp. Prague. Tempsky. 1 Mk.
- Illmann (P.) De Tibulli codicis Ambrosiani auctoritate. 8vo. 85 pp. Halle. (1886.) 1 Mk. 50.
- Joel (K.) Zur Erkenntnis der geistigen Entwicklung und der schriftstellerischen Motive Platos. 8vo. 90 pp. Berlin. Heyfelder.
- Kaiser (R.) de inscriptionum graecarum interpunctione. 8vo. 38 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk.
- Koch (J.) Quaestionum de proverbii apud Aeschylum, Sophoclem, Euripidem caput I. 8vo. 92 pp. Königsberg. 1 Mk. 50.
- Kruse (H.) Über Interpolationen in Xenophon's Hellenika. 4to. 30 pp. Kiel. 2 Mk.
- Landucci (L.) Storia del diritto romano dalle origini fino al Giustiniano; corso scolastico. Fasc. II.-VI. 8vo. pp. 65-384. Padova. Sacchetti. 5 lire.
- Longinus. *Διατριβὴ ἐν Ἀργυρίῳ περὶ ὁμοιωτῶν*. De sublimitate libellus in usum scholarum ed. O. Jahn, iterum ed. J. Vahlen. 8vo. xii. 80 pp. Bonn. Marcus. 2 Mk. 40
- Lucius. L'âne. Traduction de P.-L. Courier. 32mo. xxiv. 132 pp. 4 vignettes. 12 full-page plates. Paris. Quantin. 10 fr.
- Lysias. Ausgewählte Reden. Für d. Schulgebrauch erklärt von W. Kocks. 8vo. V. 105. 199 pp. Gotha. Perthes. 3 Mk.
- Mazegger (B.) Römerfunde in Obermais bei Meran und die alte Maja Veste. 8vo. 31 pp. Meran. Pötzlberger. 80 Pf.
- Mehler (G.) Beiträge zur Bildung des griechischen Verbuns. I. Verba contracta mit langen Themavocal. II. Flexion des activen Plusquamperfects. 8vo. 90 pp. Dorpat. 1 Mk. 50.
- Meyer (A.) de compositione theogoniae Hesiodae. 8vo. 102 pp. Berlin. Mayer and Müller. 2 Mk.
- Platonis opera quae feruntur omnia ed. Schanz. Vol. III. fasc. I. Sophista. 8vo. ix. 92 pp. Leipzig. B. Tauchnitz. 2 Mk.
- Plutarchi de proverbii Alexandrinorum libellus ineditus, rec. et praefatus est C. Crusius. 4to. 34 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 2 Mk. 80.
- Quintiliani institutionis oratoriae liber X. Ed. F. Meister. 12mo. xiii. 40 pp. Prague. Tempsky. 25 pf.
- liber VII.-XII. 12mo. ii. 363 pp. Prague. Tempsky. 1 Mk. 50.
- Roby (J.) Introduzione allo studio del digesto Giustiniano. Traduzione di G. Pacchioni con prefazione di P. Cogliolo. 8vo. xxiv. 293 pp. Florence. Cammelli. 5 lire.
- Rochrig (A.) De P. Nigidio Figulo capita II. 8vo. viii. 42 pp. Coburg. Riemann. 1 Mk. 50.
- Saarman (Th.) De Oenomaos Gadareno. 8vo. 31 pp. Leipzig. 1 Mk.
- Schwartz (E.) Scholia in Euripidem, collegit, recensuit, edidit E. Schwartz. Vol. I. Scholia in Hecubam, Orestem, Phoenissas. 8vo. xvi. 415 pp. Berlin. G. Reimer. 9 Mk.
- Schaefer (F. M.) Bemerkungen zu Strabo. 4to. 17 pp. Leipzig. Hinrichs. 1 Mk.
- Streit (W.) Zur Geschichte des 2. punischen Krieges in Italien nach der Schlacht von Cannae. (*extr.* Berl. Studien). 8vo. 57 pp. Berlin. Calvary and Co. 2 Mk.
- Taciti opera quae supersunt. Rec. J. Müller. Vol. II. Historiae et opera minora. 12mo. 360 pp. Prague. Tempsky. 1 Mk. 50.
- Théocrite. Les Idylles, traduites envers par Ph. le Duc. 8vo. 139 pp. Bourg. Martin-Bottier. 3 fr.
- Vanni (A.) La universalità del diritto romano e le sue cause. 8vo. 62 pp. Urbino.
- Vergili carmina selecta, scholarum in usum ed. E. Eichler. 12mo. xxx. 200 pp. 2 plates. Prague. Tempsky. 1 Mk.
- Aeneide. Textausgabe f. d. Schulgebrauch mit. e. Aufsatz über d. Dichter, Inhaltsangaben, und Verzeichnis, der Eigennamen. 8vo. xxiv. 282 pp. Paderborn. Schöningh. 1 Mk. 50.
- Wrobel (V.) Aristotelis de perturbationibus animi doctrina. 8vo. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 1. 20.
- Xenophon. Memorabillen. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von E. Weissenborn. III. IV. 8vo. iii. 93-181 pp. Gotha. Perthes. 2 Mk. 40.
- Zimmermann (E.) De epistulari temporum usu Ciceroniano Quaestiones Grammaticales. II. 4to. 81 pp. Rostenburg 1 Mk.

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

(Continued from page 171.)

OXFORD.

UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIPS: *Mathematical Senior Sch.*, Herschel Astron. Prize, C. E. Haselfoot, New (Winchester); *Accessit*, C. H. Thompson, Queens (Hoddesdon); *Junior Sch.*, A. L. Dixon, Worcester (Kingswood); *Exh.*, J. S. Tucker, Balliol (Bristol); *Accesserunt*, R. C. Fowler, New (Winchester), J. L. S. Hatton, Hertford (Ashby); *Rudcliffe (Medical) Fellowship*, W. Overend, Balliol (Royal School of Mines).

UNIVERSITY PRIZES: *Latin Verse*, R. R. Marett, Balliol (Jersey); *Greek Verse*, F. W. Hall, Trinity (S. Paul's); *Acc.*, G. I. Siney, Balliol (Rugby);

G. C. Richards, Balliol (Rugby); *Greek Prose*, G. G. A. Murray, S. John's (Merchant Taylors'); *Acc.*, S. A. Alexander, Trinity (S. Paul's); *English Verse*, S. A. Alexander, Trinity (S. Paul's); *English Essay*, H. W. Horwill, Wadham (Shebbear); *Ellerton Essay*, E. E. Kellett, Wadham (Kingswood); *Poem on Sacred Subject*, W. H. Savile, Keble (Haileybury); *Green Moral Philosophy Prize*, S. Alexander, Fellow of Lincoln (Melbourne); *Greek Testament* (jun.), W. Marsh, Exeter (Durham University); *Proz. Acc.*, S. A. Alexander, Trinity (S. Paul's); *Septuagint*

(sen.), H. J. Cohen, Jesus (Univ. Coll. London); *Præc. Acc.*, H. D. S. Sweetapple, Queen's; *Septuagint* (jun.), C. W. Dickinson, Non-Coll.; *Præc. Acc.*, R. W. Baker, Magdalen, R. G. Plumptre, Exeter (Winchester); *Lothian Essay*, O. M. Edwards, Balliol (Aberystwith and Glasgow); *Acc.*, J. C. Bailey, New (Haileybury), W. Waite, Balliol.

CLASSICAL MODERATIONS.—*Class 1*: S. A. Alexander, Trin. (S. Paul's), E. N. Bennett, Hertf. (Durham), G. T. Birch, Linc. (Wrexham), W. C. Bosanquet, New (Eton), E. G. Bowring, Hertf. (Jersey), H. Bull, Univ. (Chr. Hosp.), W. Busby, New (Winchester); E. K. Chambers, C. C. C. (Marlboro), F. D. P. Chaplin, Univ. (Harrow), F. H. Collier, Ch. Ch. (Westminster), A. C. M. Croome, Magd. (Wellington), A. A. David, Qu. (Exeter), J. N. Farquhar, Ch. Ch. (Aberdeen), R. H. Ferard, Ex. (Eton), C. M. Gillespie, Trin. (Edinburgh), W. J. Goodrich, Ball. (Charterhouse), H. L. Goudge, Univ. (Blackheath), W. A. Gray, Ball. (Aberdeen), H. S. Q. Henriques, Worc. (Manchester), A. E. Hillard, Ch. Ch. (Kingswood and Univ. Coll. London), R. Johnson, Jes. (Warwick), H. P. Lowe, Ch. Ch. (Westminster), J. A. MacKay, Ch. Ch. (Glasgow), C. E. Montague, Ball. (City of London), W. J. Morrell, Ball. (Tiverton), E. W. M. Oldridge-de-la-Hey, Univ. (Manchester), H. W. Orange, New (Winchester), A. B. Poynton, Ball. (Marlboro), G. C. Richards, Ball. (Rugby), F. S. Rossiter, Wadh. (Uppingham), G. I. Simey, Ball. (Rugby), D. A. Slater, Magd. (Bromsgrove), J. F. R. Stainer, Magd. (Winchester), E. B. Titchener, Bras. (Malvern), R. B. Tollinton, Ball. (Leamington), B. G. Ussher, New (Marlboro), A. K. Watson, Ball. (Harrow), H. W. Wilson, Trin. (Durham), W. B. Wood, Worc. (Rugby), W. J. Woodhouse, Qu. (Sedburgh).

Class 2: H. T. G. Alington, Magd., E. Anwyl, Or., J. R. Atkin, Magd., A. L. Aubin, Jes., J. M. Bastard, S. Joh., H. G. Belcher, Ex., E. J. Bidwell, Wadh., T. G. R. Blunt, Ch. Ch., T. P. Broadbent, Or., P. Broke, Mer., H. C. Burnett, Bras., H. W. Carlton, Linc., H. L. M. Cary, Or., R. B. Clark, S. Joh., H. B. Clarke, Wadh., J. R. Cooke, Wadh., E. W. Cornwall, Keb., F. J. K. Cross, New, W. M. Crowdy, Bras., A. H. Crowther, Jes., H. C. Cure, Hertf., C. S. Currie, Bras., G. R. Dale, Univ., W. G. de Burgh, Mer., E. W. M. de Jersey, New, A. Dewes, Ball., G. F. Dugard, Jes., A. G. Essery, S. Joh., H. J. Essex, Jes., G. L. Evans, C. C. C., A. G. Every, Pemb., H. F. Fisher, Trin., F. Fletcher, Ball., K. B. D. Forbes, S. Joh., H. A. Francis, Keb., H. C. Garden, Bras., W. G. Griffiths, Jes., R. D. Grindley, Trin., R. C. Guy, Hertf., H. E. D. Hammond, C. C. C., E. C. Harpur, New, L. W. Harry, Bras., E. J. Harvey, C. C. C., E. Hill, Pemb., J. W. Hills, Ball., D. J. Hussey-Freke, Magd., J. C. Inghis, New, J. A. Johnston, Ball., F. H. Johnstone, Wadh., E. W. Jones, Bras., H. Kempson, Ch. Ch., I. Kent, New, G. Landon, Linc., J. M. Latham, C. C. C., S. W. Lovell, Linc., E. W. Lummis,

Worc., W. G. Max-Müller, Univ., E. G. Mayo Trin., P. B. Mellish, C. C. C., J. Mill, Trin., A. C. Moore, Qu., E. W. Moore, Ch. Ch., G. F. I. Mortimer, Ball., C. P. F. O'Dwyer, Pemb., A. A. Ogle, Keb., S. C. Parmiter, Or., W. R. W. Peel, Ball., E. H. Polehampton, Qu., H. T. Powell, Magd., J. M. Quicke, Hertf., L. Ragg, Ch. Ch., H. W. Rhodes, Worc., G. Richardson, S. Joh., J. G. Robinson, C. C. C., R. Robinson, Bras., E. St. Leger, New, J. Sankey, Jes., W. H. G. Southcomb, Ex., T. G. Spyers, Magd., W. Sterry, Mer., W. G. Stone, Ball., S. Swire, Ex., W. E. Teschemaker, Mer., W. R. Thomas, Qu., W. E. Thomson, Or., J. G. Thornton, Keb., C. W. Tweedy, Qu., A. Wade, All Soul's, F. W. Waldock, Hertf., W. T. H. Walsh, S. Joh., H. Ward, C. C. C., L. H. White, C. C. C.

MERTON *Cl. Postm.*: V. L. Johnstone, Wellington, A. W. G. Aitken, Bedford; *Cl. Ech.*: D. Mack. Lamont, Aberdeen; *New Nat. Sci. Ech.*: A. Stewart, Eton; *LINCOLN Cl. Sch.*: W. P. H. Strange, S. Paul's, R. B. Maurice, Marlboro, A. H. Tollit, Magd. Coll. School, E. J. W. Houghton, Swansea; *Cl. Ech.*: H. C. Lipsett, Chr. Hosp., C. A. Pease, Clifton, W. A. Fox, Clifton; *Ch. Ch. Official Student*: W. Hobhouse (Hertf.), Eton; *JESUS Cl. Sch.*: R. C. Brown, Clergy Orphan Sch., H. E. A. Cotton, Sherborne, A. C. Stephens, Rugby, E. G. Wilkinson, Kingswood, T. E. Evans, Cowbridge, A. Rogers, Swansea; *Ech.*: A. F. Pollard, Felstead, J. R. Smart, Vica, Truro, C. E. Ind, Brecon, J. A. Thomas (Jes. Coll.), G. S. Davies, Rossall, A. C. Evans, Brecon, J. E. Jones, Llandovery, J. H. Pugh, Brecon, T. S. Roberts, Llanrwst; *PEMBROKE Cl. Sch.*: C. Field, J. E. Sugars, Manchester, T. I. Williams, Jersey; *Ech.*: C. S. Boyle, Guernsey; *KEBLE Cl. Sch.*: T. S. Peppin, Bath Coll., E. G. S. North, Blackheath; *Cl. Ech.*: R. A. Cholmeley (Keb.), Highgate, R. T. Jourdain, Haileybury; C. G. Spencer, Marlboro; *Hist. Sch.*: W. M. Childs, Portsmouth; *Hist. Ech.*: W. A. G. Etheridge (Keb.), Magd. Coll. Sch., H. Jordan, Cheltenham.

ANNOUNCEMENTS.

Merton: Two Classical Fellowships, value £200 per annum, tenable for 7 years, next October. Date of examination not yet fixed.

Brasenose: Tuesday, June 28, and following days. Hulme Exhibition in Modern History, £80 for 4 years. Candidates to be under 20 on July 7, to need assistance, and to apply by letter to the Principal not later than June 1.

Trinity and Wadham Scholarships: Examination begins Thursday, November 24, at 9.30 A.M. Four Scholarships at each college, value £80, and (possibly) Exhibitions at either college for deserving candidates. Optional papers will be set in Mathematics, French and German. Candidates to be under 19 on the day of election, and to call on the President or Warden at 5 P.M. on November 23.

CAMBRIDGE.

UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIPS.—*Bell* (Classical): E. Abbott, Caius (S. Paul's), H. W. Auden, Christ's (Shrewsbury), E. E. Sikes, S. John's (Aldenhurst), H. B. Walters, King's (Eton); *Abbott* (Math.): G. F. Emery, Trinity (Ely), W. Hall, King's (Rossall); *Barnes* (Math.): G. T. Walker, Trinity (S. Paul's); *Lightfoot* (History): R. C. Wilton, S. Catherine's.

UNIVERSITY PRIZES.—*Reading Prizes*: L. G. B. J. Ford, King's (Repton), H. E. Sherlock, Selwyn (Lancing); *Hulcan Essay* ('86): J. C. Nicol, Trin. Hall (Birmingham).

COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS.—*Clare*: (Math. Sch.) J. G. Greenhalgh, Manchester, H. G. A. Leveson, Wren and Gurney, P. Boyd, Uppingham; (Cl. Sch.) G. A.

Purton, Shrewsbury, F. de W. Lushington, Sutton Valence; (Nat. Sci. Sch.) E. S. Hayward, Weymouth, A. E. Lee, Merchant Taylors'; *Trinity Hall*: (Math. Sch.) G. P. Turnbull, Isle of Man; (Cl. Sch.) H. Sutthery, Oundle, D. Black, Ely, F. Ayers, Perse School, H. C. Harvey, Clifton, H. A. Nicolas, Tonbridge; *S. Catherine's*: (Cl.) W. E. Orrey, Isle of Man, E. P. Schjott, Cranbrook, H. Sutthery, Oundle, H. K. Gracey, City of London, M. G. V. Cole, Brentwood, E. D. Lawson, Dedham, J. Mackintosh, Newcastle (Staff.); *Magdalene*: (Cl. Sch.) W. F. Baldock, Ipswich; (Milner Sch.) — Robinson, Heversham.